REPORT RESUMES

ED 019 518 VT 005 653

AN EXPERIMENTAL AND DEMONSTRATION MANPOWER PROGRAM FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTHS. FINAL REPORT.

BY- GREENFIELD, RICHARD
NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION, BROOKLYN, N.Y.
PUB DATE 66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$5.80 143P.

DESCRIPTORS- EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS, *DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, URBAN SCHOOLS, STAFF UTILIZATION, VOCATIONAL COUNSELING, *COUNSELING PROGRAMS, REMEDIAL READING, *UNEMPLOYED, *VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, INTERAGENCY COOPERATION, JOB PLACEMENT, PROGRAM EVALUATION, RECRUITMENT, REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION, MDTA PROGRAMS,

THE JOB COUNSELING CENTER INITIATED AN EXPERIMENTAL AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM TO TEST THE THESIS THAT AN URBAN SCHOOL COULD PROVIDE A MANPOWER TRAINING PROGRAM TO OUT-OF-SCHOOL, UNEMPLOYED, AND DISADVANTAGED YOUTH. LICENSED SCHOOL PERSONNEL WERE USED IN FOUR CENTERS IN AREAS HAVING HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT RATES AND A CONCENTRATION OF NEGRO AND PUERTO RICAN FAMILIES TO PROVIDE COUNSELING, REMEDIAL EDUCATION, SHORT-TERM VOCATIONAL TRAINING, AND JOB PLACEMENT SERVICES. THE HIGHEST SOURCE OF RECRUITMENT WAS REFERRAL BY OTHER CLIENTS. THE COUNSELING PROGRAM CONCENTRATED ON QUICK JOB PLACEMENT FOR CLIENTS AND USED BOTH LICENSED SCHOOL COUNSELORS AND SOCIAL WORKERS. REMEDIAL READING INSTRUCTION WAS OFFERED ON A VOLUNTARY BASIS, AND MOST CLIENTS WHO STAYED WITH THE PROGRAM 6 MONTHS OR MORE SHOWED GAINS. SKILLS TRAINING, OFFERED IN "TRY-OUT SHOPS" IN TYPING AND OFFICE MACHINES, PROVED MOTIVATIONAL BUT DID NOT PROVIDE SALABLE SKILLS EXCEPT IN A FEW CASES. INDUSTRIAL SHOPS WERE DISCONTINUED, AND CLIENTS WERE REFERRED TO OTHER INSTITUTIONS FOR SUCH TRAINING. THE PROGRAM COOPERATED WITH OTHER AGENCIES AND OTHER SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS WITH SOME SUCCESS IN OBTAINING SERVICES, TRAINING, AND JOB PLACEMENT FOR SOME CLIENTS. THERE WERE 5,986 EMPLOYMENT REFERRALS AND 3,493 CLIENT PLACEMENTS DURING THE PROGRAM. THE PROGRAM DEMONSTRATED THAT A SCHOOL SYSTEM CAN PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL WHO ARE QUALIFIED TO RUN A PROGRAM FOR OUT-OF-SCHOOL AND DISADVANTAGED YOUTH. EXTENSIVE DISCUSSION OF EACH FACET OF THE PROGRAM, GENERAL EVALUATIVE STATEMENTS, AND A SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS ARE INCLUDED. (EM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE JOB COUNSELING CENTER
BOARD OF EDUCATION
CITY OF NEW YORK

AN EXPERIMENTAL AND DEMONSTRATION MANPOWER PROGRAM FOR DISADVANTAGED YOUTHS

February 1, 1965 - September 30, 1966

FINAL REPORT

To

Office of Manpower, Planning,
Evaluation and Research

U.S. Department of Labor
Washington, D. C.

Richard Greenfield
Project Director

Charles W. Soffel
Project Historian

INTRODUCTION TO THE FINAL REPORT

The Job Counseling Center has completed a twenty month contract with the U.S. Department of Labor. It was an Experimental and Demonstration Program, and it was funded to test the thesis that an urban school system could provide the services of a manpower program to a population which was out of school, unemployed, and disadvantaged.

The design of the program was simple. Licensed school personnel would operate centers located in vocational high schools in the evening. The centers would provide counseling, remedial education, and short-term vocational training. A full-time placement component would develop jobs for the clients as quickly as possible, since employment was the most prevalent need for this population. The major program thrust was to encourage youth by our post-placement activities - to build on the solid base of continuous employment through involvement in a variety of activities leading to his upgrading.

The initial problems that beset the program were great. The JCC was not community based. Its affiliation was with the Board of Education. It had to achieve community acceptance on its own. If it were not for the freedom and protection of its E and D status, the program may not have survived. In the early months it was relatively unknown both within the Board and community, and it was left to find its own direction and develop its own potential. Because of the E and D label, no one was ever quite sure what was expected. The happy result of the ambiguity was that no existing institution felt threatened by the program's existence.

The ambiguity also had happy internal results. Since we had no limited goals, the staff continually experimented and expanded its service to our clients. We did not just get a youth a job, and then rest on our laurels. The question that guided all our efforts was, "What more can we do?"

Perhaps it is only in retrospect that we can see the positive implications of a situation which, at the time, was marked by some anxiety and confusion. Like all other E and D Programs, we had our dark moments, our worries about refunding, and our feelings of inadequacy. In the absence of established absolutes, against which we could measure success and failure, our focus kept coming back to the youths who were coming to us for help. That focus is the essence of an E and D Program.

It is too soon to evaluate the ultimate impact of our efforts, either on our clients, the Board, or the City, but we know that none of it would have been possible without the freedom, the challenge, the responsibility, and of course, the money that came with the E and D contract.

Special note must be made of individuals not directly connected with the day-to-day activities of the JCC whose concern helped make the entire program feasible.

Mrs. Mary Kohler's efforts in pressing for the initial sub mission of a Board of Education proposal within the E & D structure was critical as the JCC first emerged as a sub-contractor of J.O.I.N. of New York City. Mrs. Kohler's personal interest during the succeeding thirty months was always helpful, particularly to the Project Director. His "OJT" period with her as he moved from the school world to the Manpower world in the early hectic period beginning in the summer of 1963, telescoped what might have been a longer period of getting to know the Manpower constituency.

Dr. Nathan Brown was an Ass't Superintendent in the Child Welfare Division of the Board ofEducation at the time of the initial contract signing. In later pages his support for the JCC within the Board structure is alluded to. It was Dr. Brown who did much to establish the openness and spirit of innovation which led us to what we believe is our "store" of truths about youth serving projects. His most familiar response was - "Let's try it and see how it works". This attitude permeated the thinking of the entire staff and permitted us to be as creative as we dared.

Mrs. Shaw, Director of the Bureau of Educational Vocational Guidance, made those administrative decisions which enabled us to bring into the program a small number of gifted members of her Bureau to work full-time on this project.

If there is, at this point, a note of dedication of this report, it must go to the magnificent evening staff who were able to grow and grow in their expertise.

The body of this report includes the record of our work for the past eighteen months. It is divided in sections to correspond with the proposal description of Special Reports that were planned. It was suggested by the Department of Labor that we incorporate all the unsubmitted Special Reports under this cover. Together with the Progress Reports and monographs already submitted, this Final Report constitutes the entire written record of the Job Counseling Center for the contract period.

This report on a special manpower project was prepared under a contract with the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research, U. S. Department of Labor, under the authority of the Manpower Development and Training Act. Organizations undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Labor.

TABLE OF - CONTENTS -

	Pages:		
RECRUITMENT	R-1	to	R-15
COUNSELING	C-1	to	C-21
REMEDIAL READING	RDG-1	to	RDG-15
TRY-OUT SHOPS	T-O-1	to	T-O-11
OUTSIDE SERVICES	OS-1	to	OS-10
JOB DEVELOPMENT AND PLACEMENT	JD&P-1	to	JD&P-30
PROJECT IMPACT	PI-1	to	PI-15
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION	S-1	to	S-12

FINAL REPORT - RECRUITMENT
(in lieu of Selection Report)

OUTLINE

Recruitment and Community Penetration

A. Identification of Target Population

   1. Location of Clients
   2. Demographic Characteristics

B. Methods of Reaching Clients

   1. Use of Mass Media
   2. Referral by Public and Private Agencies
   3. Outreach and Self-Referral
   4. Location of Project Services

C. First Contact with the Trainee

   1. Purpose of Intake Interview
   2. Techniques Used for Intake Interview
   3. Holding Time between Intake and Other Activities
   4. Intake Quotas and Service to Non-Eligibles

- -

A-1 Location of Clients

The first step in locating clients was to open centers in areas designated as poverty stricken. Any agency offering job placement can expect substantial numbers of applicants who hear of the service through the grapevine; if the center is located in a middle class neighborhood, it will draw middle-class applicants. We had this experience with our Queens center, which was opened in Sunnyside. After a few weeks, it became apparent that the majority of the applicants were middle-class high-school graduates who wanted help finding jobs. The center was moved to South Jamaica, to locate it in an unmistakenly disadvantaged area. The difference in characteristics of the applicants was immediately evident.

The other three areas chosen for center locations were the East New York section of Brooklyn, the South East Bronx, and the Lower West Side of Manhattan. Each of these is characterized by high unemployment rates, concentrations of Negro and Puerto Rican families, low median family incomes, and high percentages of aid to dependent children. Each of these has been designated by New York City as a poverty area.

Observations on the relationships that exist between poverty, unemployment, and low educational levels can be made without bogging down in the dynamics of these sociological phenomena. Dropout rates are higher for youths who come from nonwhite families and from poor families. For recruitment purposes, it is only logical to maintain centers in areas having a higher than average percentage of these two factors. The program itself of course will have to come to grips with breaking the cycle or changing the patterns; this section of the report deals with identifying and locating the target population.

Once the centers were placed in locations accessible to large numbers of disadvantaged youth, the program began the task of making itself known to the community and to the individual youths in need of service.

A-2 Demographic Characteristics

The proposal stipulated that service would be offered to disadvantaged youth, 16-21, out of school and unemployed. Since we relied heavily on lists of school leavers supplied by the schools for recruitment purposes, we were able to maintain selectivity. We only used lists from schools known to be heavily populated with minority youths, and known to have a high dropout rate. Schools with high academic ratings and special trade schools were generally too selective for our target population. No means test was applied; we relied on the prevalence of poverty in the areas we served and the discretion of the counselors during intake interviews to insure the program's concentration of services on disadvantaged youngsters. Our statistics show that 81 per cent of the youths we served were either Negro or Puerto Rican, and 54 per cent did not go beyond the tenth grade in school. Of those clients on whom we have information concerning previous work experience, 26 per cent never worked; of those who worked, only seven per cent ever earned more than $75 in any one week.

In order to receive service, a youth had to come in to an evening center. This simple fact can be seen in itself as a selection process, whereby the most alienated youths just do not respond to recruitment appeals. Most of the youths who came in were looking for work; the program was designed to function by meeting this immediate need first and then offering help in other areas.

B. METHODS OF REACHING CLIENTS

B-1 Use of Mass Media

Mass media appeals were generally avoided because of the fear of a sudden rush of new clients who could not be served immediately. The staff was very conscious of the negative effect of delays in service, and all aspects of the program were designed to minimize waiting time for clients. On two occasions, one of the centers planted news articles to bolster recruitment. The emphasis was on our placement abilities, and the response was significant in terms of numbers. However, the pressure mounted on the staff to supply jobs quickly, often on the youths' first visit.

In retrospect, the process was negative in terms of the program's long range goals. Under the pressure of numbers, the only service that could be given was a job referral. The establishment of a counseling relationship was practically impossible when a center was flooded with job applicants. The program's "holding power" depended on the client's perception of the center as a place to get help, and the counselor as the client's agent.

B-2 Referral by Public and Private Agencies

Direct referrals from schools (primarily from guidance counselors) accounted for 16 per cent of the caseload. These referrals were the result of personal contacts of the staff with school personnel. The school system aided recruitment by mandating Exit Interviews for school leavers, which is described in the following section.

Referrals by non-school agencies, public and private, totalled 15 per cent of all clients. Referring agencies ran the gamut from parole boards to charitable organizations. They were contacted by the JCC and apprised of its services by mail, phone, and personal visits.

Most of the agency referrals were made in response to our offers of employment help. Having our own job development component was at times a mixed blessing; it gave us leverage with those agencies who had contact with out target population, but the clients who were referred to us often wanted only a job. The JCC consciously avoided being characterized as an employment agency, but often we had clients sent to us for just that service.

One problem that was often characteristic of agency referrals was the urgency of the cases referred. We have at times felt as if we were a court of last resort. Numerous clients were sent to us with an eviction notice in their pocket, or the threat of a judge to lock them up the next day if they were not working. Pressure of that sort adds a touch of the dramatic to the center, but it does not always lend itself to implementation of the program.

During the period of the program's operation, the anti-poverty movement authorized by the Economic Opportunities Act began to crystallize in our communities. The JCC established liaison with the emerging structures by supplying consultant help and making known our services.

Community Progress Centers were established in the four areas we were serving, and in each case our staff met with CPC personnel to effect some coordination of services Since the JCC was an ongoing program, it was used by the CPC's as a resource for youth services. A detailed account of the interaction between the JCC and the CPC's follows in another section since it involves more than recruitment, but it should be noted here that the JCC imbedded itself in the total community program as a youth agency. The centers were visited by Community leaders, and methods of referral and feedback were established.

Involvement with the CPC's began to intensify in the last six months of the program since the CPC's were only recently organized. The degree of coordination varied with each center, depending on the speed with which each CPC set up a program. If funding is approved by OEO for expansion of the program, the JCC will become part of the Community Action Program in the capacity of a youth manpower agency.

B-3 Outreach and Self- Referral

The major active method of outreach was sending letters to out-of-school youths. The Junior and Senior High Schools of the City were required to fill out a withdrawal form for each youth leaving school. These forms were sent to the JCC, thereby giving us the most complete list of the out-of-school population. Mailings were made from the lists on periodic basis in order to maintain a steady flow of new cases.

The use of letters had the advantage of giving us control over the numbers of incoming clients. When the centers were busy, no letters were sent; during slow periods, mailing was stepped up to stimulate activity. Twenty per cent of our caseload came to the centers in response to the letters.

A current list of school leavers has obvious potential for youth programs. Even in an unsophisticated form, having only names and addresses, such a list may constitute the only means of locating this population. One of its shortcomings is that it quickly becomes outdated because of the high mobility of disadvantaged youth. However, our experience with this list was rewarding enough to allow us to urge that every urban school system should compile data on school leavers and supply them to agencies offering service.

One of the indications of a program's effectiveness is the number of clients who are referred by other clients. For the JCC, the highest single source of recruitment was its clients: 37 per cent of the caseload came to us because of a friend's recommendation. In our Brooklyn center, which was the most active in terms of numbers served, 50 per cent of the clients were referred by friends.

These figures say more about the performance of the program than its recruitment techniques, but they concern an essential ingredient for success: acceptance by the target population. For many of the "hard core" in this population, peer judgments may be the only significant motivating factor in terms of recruitment.

The program did not have outreach workers. Since recruitment was never a serious problem, the lack of outreach workers did not hamper the program's operations. It did, however, have a psychological effect. We had no assurance that we were reaching the most disadvantaged population. We sent out letters and we made appeals to agencies, but we had no means of going into the streets. As partial compensation for this sense of distance, some recruitment was done by telephone - usually as a follow-up to a letter.

To test the effectiveness of intensive recruiting appeals, one counselor was given a list of names and was told to recruit as many as he could over a six-week period. He sent letters to each of the youths, and then began to make follow-up phone calls. Each week he would call or write those youths who had not responded or shown up. He found that each additional call brought in additional clients. Some of them came in only after four or five contacts were made.

This experiment indicated that programs recruiting on an individual basis (rather than through mass media appeals) can improve their rate of response by multiple recruitment appeals to the same population.

B-4 Location of Project Services

The four evening centers were situated in such a way that we could recruit on a city-wide basis. Except for youths living in Staten Island and some of the remote sections of Brooklyn, the centers were readily accessible A client could go to the center most convenient to him and receive essentially the same services.

The centers were self-contained units. A client seeking employment, remediation, counseling, or some shop experience could be served on the spot since the facilities of the vocational high schools were flexible enough to provide these services. Special needs of course necessitated referrals to other facilities, but we attempted to provide a variety of services in each center to help identify the program as a multi-component resource for the client.

The Bronx center experimented with offering one service - a typing shop - in a separate facility. For a period of about two months, the typing shop was run in a social settlement located in a public housing project. We were testing the possibility of decentralizing the program and gaining added community exposure. The two-month trial period was extremely disappointing. Our clients resented having to go to two locations for service, and the exposure brought us no new clients from the housing project. As a result, the shop was moved back t the Bronx center.

C. FIRST CONTACT WITH THE TRAINEE

C-1 Purpose of Intake Interview

The three major objectives of the Intake Interview were:

1. To determine the client's eligibility for servic
2. To record personal data.
3. To discover the client's immediate needs.

The form used on intake tried to reflect all of these objectives, which led to some confusion. An intake process with clearer definitions and delineations would have avoided some of the problems without losing sight of the objectives.

C-2 Techniques Used for Intake Interview

A client coming into a center for the first time was greeted by a secretary. When it was established that the client was new, the secretary determined his age and school status as a quick check for eligibility. The next step was to fill out an Intake Sheet in duplicate.

Most of the time, the Intake Sheet was completed by the secretary before the client was introduced to a counselor. If several new clients were waiting, the counselors would be asked to complete the Intake Sheet themselves to cut down on waiting time. The emphasis during the intake process was on movement.

The Intake Sheet was a single page form. It was designed to give information to the counselor and the job developer, and to provide data for a final evaluation at the end of the program. The counselor kept the original in his files and recorded subsequent counselling sessions on it. The carbon copy was forwarded to the Administrative Office's central files.

We had several problems concerning the Intake Sheet.

1. When the questions touched on sensitive areas, the clients often reacted defensively and avoided the truth. This fact was uncovered through the counseling relationship, wherein the clients tended to be much more candid than in an interview with a secretary. To avoid this in the future, a new form was devised. The top section, for information like name, address, and phone number, will be completed by the secretary. The bottom section will be com-

pleted by the counselor and will contain school record, work record, and family information.

2. Sometimes the Intake Sheet was not completed on the first visit. When additional information was gained, it often was added to the counselor's copy but not the central file copy. The only way to determine if the carbon copy had all the information on the original was to compare the two.
3. Because so many individuals filled out Intake Sheets, there was a variety of misinterpretations and omissions. Some counselors, for instance, never recorded certain data on any of their clients, apparently because in their perception the information was not particularly relevant to the counseling relationship.
4. Since the Intake Sheet contained information which was confidential, the counselors resented sharing it with other staff members. It seems obvious now that the Intake Sheet should not have recorded data which may have been confidential, since the Intake Sheet had more functions than as a counselor's record. A revision of the form for the future should eliminate this conflict. We are enclosing both the old and revised forms of the Intake Sheet for comparison.

The Intake Interview started with the secretary and ended with the counselor. The counselor used the interview procedure to begin a counseling relationship with the client. There was no clear line between the interview and the counseling process. Since most of our clients came to the centers for a job rather than for counseling, this blending of information-gathering and counseling at least avoided a clinical atmosphere in the first interview.

The JCC strived, in its Intake procedures, for two conditions. The first was a minimum of waiting time for new clients, and the second was an avoidance of unnecessary red tape. We had heard enough derogatory comments about other programs that had both of these shortcomings to realize that we had to be on our guard lest we be seen in the same light. We had to overcome the tendency to assume, because some of our clients complained about other agencies, that we were incapable of committing the same atrocities. Every youth who came into an evening center was given service that night. The services varied with the needs of the individuals, but the minimum was a session with a counselor during which the program was explained and the options to the client were made known.

An extremely important element of intake procedures was the personal reception afforded a new client. A hostile or indifferent receptionist could generate a range of negative feelings in disadvantaged youths and thereby cause an effective mental block. Our receptionists worked as school secretaries during the day; their orientation in the JCC did not have to include clerical skills or office procedure. What was stressed was the difference of the JCC from a school situation. Informality, warmth, and involvement were the key elements the receptionists contributed to the tone and atmosphere of the evening centers.

C-3 Holding Time Between Intake and Other Services

Since we had no cyclical components, entry into a class or shop was immediate. After talking to a counselor, a new client could, if he wanted to, involve himself in remedial work or explore the vocational areas of the shops. Accessibility of the services was a planned part of the program's attempt to move the client quickly.

The program was built around the relationship of counselor and client. That service began ten minutes after the youth walked in the door. The success of the counselors in establishing a meaningful relationship varied, but the attempt was made immediately on intake. It was through the counselor that the client explored the possibilities open to him, and the exploration began right away.

For the client, the other services were usually his immediate goals - a job, remedial help, training. But for the program, they were supportive services to a process of growth and maturation, a process aided by the counselor. In that sense, waiting time was seen as destructive.

C-4 Intake Quotas and Service to Non-Eligibles

New clients were absorbed into the program as they came in to a center. No one was turned away, as long as they were eligible under the program's guidelines. Fortunately, the shops and classes were able to serve all the youths who wanted help in those areas. An extra instructor was put on occasionally if the demand existed for additional service.

Quotas became a reality only when we used outside programs as service facilities for our clients. Frequently, special training programs would open up around the City and we would go through a week of frenzy, contacting clients, filling out applications, writing letters of referral. We of course attempted to anticipate program openings, but many times we had no advance word. The problem created by this system was that clients who had expressed a desire for a particular type of training often could not be contacted when that training became available.

A phenomenon of this situation was that clients who just happened to walk into a center while recruitment was open for a special program could enter that program immediately. A large element of chance was thus intruded into a process that should be more controlled. If those clients walked in a week earlier or later, they would have missed the opportunity.

We became increasingly more concerned with this problem, and we tried to minimize it by extending our antennae into the anti-poverty bureaucracies and by keeping the counselors informed of upcoming programs that we knew of. What came out of these efforts is a specialized expertise that is invaluable to a program like the JCC which has limited training and no stipends. Although we have made great progress in this area, there is still no guarantee that the right youth will always get into the right program.

Non-eligible applicants to the program were given whatever service we could provide on a one-shot basis. The job developers often knew of openings for older people and they would make referrals for applicants in that category. For youths who were still in school, the job developers could often provide part-time employment, since our clients were seeking full-time jobs. Many times, the service given was just some information or a referral to another program or agency; in any case, no person who came into an evening center was told, "We can't help you."

Siblings and parents of clients were among those given service which was not recorded in our records. In one case, we were asked to provide ten part-time jobs for youths in the Police Cadet Program. The job developer who handled this task wound up placing eighty-five youths on part-time jobs, in addition to handling all the placement from his center. These jobs did not appear on any placement records since the youths were not actually part of our caseload.

COUNSELING

I INTRODUCTION

Restatement of the centrality of counseling, and the unevenness of implementation

II FIRST INTERVIEW

1. Client anticipation
2. Projection of role image
3. Time and movement

III STAFF TRAINING

IV METHODS AND CONTENT

....

I INTRODUCTION

The philosophical commitment to counseling as the central element in the program has been stated in every Progress Report and discussion of the program. The variables which affected the implementation of the concept were numerous and often contradictory. Not the least of these variables was the interpretation by the counselors of their own roles in the program. Questions like, "How long do we hold a client? How deep should we go?", have been part of the staff's introspection and self-evaluation since the program's earliest days.

The goals of the counseling, as determined in this program by the proposal, varied from counselor to counselor, from center to center, from month to month, sometimes falling short sometimes over-reaching. When jobs were scarce, and the counselors felt they had very little to offer their clients, the counseling was affected. Conversely, when jobs were plentiful, or a newly funded program was opened to our youths, quick movement of the clients out into the job world or program often became the only identifiable activity of the counselors.

The varied backgrounds of the counselors caused differences in emphasis - differences that were not seen as being necessarily harmful to the program. The mix of counselors with experience in junior high schools, high schools, special schools for the socially maladjusted, and social work was intended to provide the program with depth and range in its counseling component. Interaction between counselors was anticipated, as well as flexibility in approach provided by the different disciplines. In retrospect, no one approach to counseling has prevailed; neither have the counselors abandoned their own methodology. What has occurred, however, is a greater awareness on the part of the counselors of the values of the other disciplines and their particular contributions to the problems of the target population.

These differences in implementation ofthe counseling component, as opposed to the single thread of thought in the proposal, must be explained in advance of a description of counseling so the reader can anticipate the reflection of these differences in the body of the report. The elements that went into the synthesis of program thinking about counseling are important in their own right and deserve description and consideration, since no one final answer has been arrived at. Some "truths" have emerged from our experiences, but they do not preclude the validity of the dissenting voices in our on-going dialogue.

II FIRST INTERVIEW

1. Client Anticipation - The coping devices of disadvan-

taged youths are generally sufficiently developed to present a danger to servicing agencies - the danger of blocking any real communication. New clients have their own preconceptions of what any agency expects of them, and if they are coming in for service like a job, they will be sensitive to the cues being thrown out to them by the staff on the role they have to play to get the service.

It is probably safe to say that few youths came in to a center to be counselled. The unspoken question in the youth's mind was, "What do I have to do to get the job?" If a counselor's pet theory holds that minority youths are damaged by racial prejudice, he would probably hear from the youth instances of injustice to which the youth had been subjected. If a counselor was strongly oriented to personal-social counseling, he would probably evoke from the client details of an intolerable home situation. If a counselor believed that formal schooling or training was the only key to success, he would probably hear the youth say he wanted desperately to go back to school.

Another attitude that many youths brought with them was plain fear. Many of them had had painful experiences with agencies and schools, and they had no way of knowing that this experience would be any different. A subdued, shy, or apologetic youngster was easier to work with, and the danger existed that the counselor might reinforce his fears just to maintain an air of placidity and tractability. For the JCC, operating in school buildings, awareness of this possibility was essential for the counseling component to perform as it was intended.

2. Protection of Role Image - With this awareness of client anticipation, the counselors had the task of actively projecting an image of themselves and the program which was both true and helpful. When the projection was most noticeable, it tended to communicate two ideas: an acceptance of the youth as he was, and a recognition of his basic needs.

As simple as this sounds, it was not always the rule. We had far too many youths who came in once and never returned to assume that we always opened up channels of communication to every youth who walked in the door. Of course, many of the one-shot clients were agency shopping, or satisfying parental demands. The ideal situation for this program, and for similar programs, would be a follow-up study of those youths who do not return to identify those aspects of the program's first impressions that were negative. Despite the absence of such a study, we can still say that some youths never returned because they were turned off by what they saw when they walked into a center. However, 27% of clients in a survey we did saw the counselor only once. How many of these received other service? -- jobs, referrals to other programs, etc. we do not know.

The importance of the first interview became increasingly clear as the program progressed. Counseling could have no measurable impact if the client did not return, and his return was partly determined by what happened on the first visit. Every counselor could point to that portion of his caseload that was availing itself of his services, but there were no ready answers for those youths who did not return. Holding techniques were discussed constantly, and special emphasis was given to initial impact.

The counselors were divided on the question of who should fill out the Intake Form. All of them were working, from the moment they were introduced to a client, to establish a good relationship. Some of them saw the Intake Form as a useful tool to gain information about the youth, his background, his family situation, and his attitudes. They preferred to interview the youth themselves, seeing the immediate response as helpful to their role. Others felt the routine questions did nothing to establish for the client the image of a helping person that the counselor wanted to project.

An essential factor in the counselors' introductory session with new clients was recognition and acceptance of the clients' immediate needs. As a matter of course, each counselor discussed with the client what it was had brought him to the center. Most often it was employment. The counselor could point out the job developer in the center and assure the youth that placement was not a remote possibility but a proximate reality. Usually it was only after this reassurance was given that the counselor could begin to broach other areas with the youth.

This kind of reassurance was extremely important to our clients. Most of them had enough experience with agencies and schools that never delivered to be able to make a fast judgment on a program's legitimacy and integrity. In effect, then, the counselor had a very short time to welcome the youth, to listen to his needs, and to reassure him that those needs would be met. If he could do this effectively, the counselor had a chance to establish a more meaningful relationship, and perhaps provide service in a number of other areas. There was complete staff agreement that to introduce at this point a battery of psychological and aptitude tests would be destructive.

3. Time and Movement - Quick service was the JCC stock in trade, especially in job placement. The program was built on the hypothesis that delays in service would alienate the target population and seriously hamper the program's effectiveness. When the need was employment, we concentrated on employment first. After the youth was working, we had time to offer help in other areas.

Of course, if the youth took the job and did not return to the center, no additional help could be given. The program directed its energies to encouraging working clients to return, knowing that a portion of them did not need additional help and would in fact not return. For the counselors, the problem was to establish a relationship with the client in the one or two sessions before the job referral so that the client could see the value of returning for additional service. If the client were given a job as soon as he walked into a center, then the JCC would have been nothing more than an employment agency.

Having the client return for a second or third visit before introducing him to the job developer involved the risk of losing the client because of impatience. Some clients were so hard pressed for jobs that it would have been unrealistic and even cruel to make them wait, and in those cases the youths were sent out immediately for jobs. But the counselors had other resources to make palatable a reasonable waiting time before placement, the try-out shops and the remedial components could be shown on the client's first visit. In these instances, the shops provided pre-vocational service to the youth. Sample employment tests were given, brush-up sessions in math or typing were provided, and reading ability was tested. The emphasis was toward a more successful job referral, rather than the recording of test scores.

At the end of the client's first visit to a center, he could perceive real service and movement. He had talked with a counselor about his needs and his aspirations, he had been introduced to the remedial program or one of the shops, he had been given an appointment for the following night, and he had been promised a job within another day or two. This was the minimum service given to every youth who came to a center.

In a city like New York, where there are hundreds of centers offering help to disadvantaged youth, comparisons are inevitable. Each program has its share of youths who have been to other agencies and are quite willing to explain what was wrong with them. The complaints may be explained in part as an attempt by the youth to tell a counselor what he wants to hear, especially about a competitor. Undoubtedly, counselors in other programs have heard complaints about the JCC from dissatisfied youths.

It is pointless to take comfort from such complaints, as if they were an endorsement of some kind, but the substance of the complaints may be valuable. In that light, we feel it is significant that the most prevalent negative feeling about youth agencies reflected frustration over waiting periods and delays before real service was forthcoming. Or, as one youth put it, "You go there week after week, and they test you, and tell you to come back, and nothing happens."

For the least employable youths, it often took several weeks before they landed a job. They may have been sent out every day for job interviews and not been hired. This kind of frustration was different from that caused by no service being offered. It may have been as destructive, but at least the counselor and the job developer could work with the youth and perhaps translate the experience into useful terms. Long waiting periods produced nothing of value to the youth, and it is this kind of frustration that we felt so strongly about.

Undoubtedly, the nature of some programs makes quick service impossible. However, every effort must be made in the planning of youth programs to minimize waiting periods and to involve the youth in some activity as quickly as possible. It has been our experience that to tell a disadvantaged youth in New York to come back in a week for service is the same as saying good-bye.

III SELECTION AND TRAINING OF COUNSELORS

One of the Demonstration features from the original proposal hypothesized that licensed school counselors could work as effectively with out of school disadvantaged youth as social agency personnel. We were not saying that the role of a counselor in a day school was sufficiently geared to the problems of the target population to guarantee success in a manpower program; we were saying, however, that licensed counselors have the training and expertise to function in this setting. As professionals, they could adapt themselves to the special demands of a manpower program.

In some instances, the distance from the school role to the manpower role was considerable, whereas the training the counselors had received enabled them to make the transition easily. It is not within the scope of this report to comment on how the school system used its counselors. The point we are making here is that many school counselors have the skill and training, if not the experience, to work with the target population in a manpower setting. The problem for the JCC was not one of training but of orientation of its counselors.

Selection of counselors for the program was personal and specific, depending heavily on a counselor's reputation with his peers. Invariably, the first question asked about a counselor being considered was, "How does he relate to kids?" Such related factors as work in a "tough" school, or experience in other programs, were also balanced in the selection process.

The restriction of hiring only licensed counselors had a double effect. It assured a high level of professional training and experience, but it also precluded competent applicants who were unlicensed. There are unfortunately too few licensed counselors who are Negro or Puerto Rican to work in programs for disadvantaged youth. The JCC was limited to only one male Negro counselor because of the licensing restriction.

The inclusion on the counseling staff of social workers from the Bureau of Attendance gave the program added flexibility in bringing in competent personnel. Their training was essentially service-oriented, as opposed to social workers from other Bureaus, and their experience was with hard-core disadvantaged youth. Their presence gave an added dimension to the counseling component because of their distance from the classroom.

Oreintation

Since this contract was an extension and an expansion of a previous one year sub-contract, the JCC lost little time in getting a staff together and beginning the program. The counselors who had worked in the program formed a nucleus around which the expanded staff was built. In February, 1965, anyone who had worked in a poverty program for a year was considered a veteran, especially around the Board of Education. So we depended on the five or six "oldtimers" to provide direction to the new staff members.

New counselors were given copies of the proposal to explain the program, and they were given several informal orientation sessions by the project director and the administrative counselors of the different centers. When the program was funded, we had two centers in operation, and we immediately opened two more. This forced us to orient new counselors quickly and depend on in-service training to help them focus on their role.

Since the counselors were professionals, our task was to fit them into the program and the center in which they worked, not to teach them counseling. Almost all the counselors began to work with clients the first night they came to work. The Administrative counselor supervised the first few sessions closely, and the other staff members lent their support to facilitate an understanding of how the program functioned.

Staff conferences were held periodically to encourage discussion and evaluation. Some of these sessions were held center by center, with all the center staff present - counselors, job developers, and instructors. These meetings allowed the different categories of staff to evaluate their roles in the total setting. Such problems as communication and coordination of program components were thrashed out at these meetings. Since the program was experimental, the staff sessions contributed to an evolution of the program's modus operandi or "style" rather than a final resolution of the major questions.

Because the staff was made up of specialists, there existed a tendency to fragment the program. The staff conferences attempted to involve the specialists in an interacting relationship with their colleagues. A remedial specialist or a shop instructor had to understand his contribution to the total program; the counselors had to appreciate the value of the special services available at the center.

The balance of the staff conferences were attended by the people from all the centers, and they generally included workshops for the different staff categories. At these sessions, the counselors had the opportunity to discuss with their counterparts at other centers the problems they were encountering in their work. This system contributed to the identification of unique problems and those that were common to the program's four centers.

The identification process was invaluable in crystallizing a mass of conflicting data and opinions. A characteristic sound at these meetings was a huge sigh of relief as a counselor discovered that what was thought to be an individual hang-up was actually a typical problem in all the centers, and probably in all manpower programs.

Some of the problems, because of their nature, have assumed an almost classic status. For instance, counselors will never cease to feel that the jobs their clients get are not good enough, in terms of creativity, upgrading potential, or salary. Also, counselors will never cease to argue about how directive they should be with their clients. It is less important for a program to resolve these problems than it is to maintain an openness and a receptivity to new approaches.

IV METHODS AND CONTENT

1- Pre-Vocational Counseling - The nature of pre-vocational counseling was primarily determined by the previous work experience of the client. Most of the youths who had been out of school a year or more had also had work experience, and so had some ability to cope with the competitive demands of the job world. They knew their way around. The counselor engaged in what is more accurately described as pre-employment counseling.

The younger clients, the recent school leavers, the youths with no work record, - these were the cases that tested a counselor's skill. They had all the textbook disabilities: immaturity, unrealistic aspirations, misconceptions of the job world, lack of self-discipline, educational deficiencies, and no salable skills. These were the youngsters who were referred to with pride as "the target population." Among the staff, that phrase became a synonym for hard core.

Pre-vocational counseling centered around the disabilitities. The delicate matter of confrontation was a major issue in this stage of counseling. Since the client wanted a job, the counselor did not have a long period of time to build up his self-image before the cold realities of the job market made themselves felt. As soon as the client was brought in to see the job developer the process of confrontation began. The counselor had to anticipate this situation and minimize its negative implications.

The role of the counselor here was different from that of the job developer, who was interested in employment. The counselor worked within a framework of the relationship he was establishing with the client. That relationship involved total acceptence of the youth in his present state, disabilities and all. The pace at which the counselor could bring the youth to look at his disabilities varied from case to case and counselor to counselor. For instance, a white middle class counselor had to be extremely careful when the client was an angry minority group youngster with obvious employment disabilities. At the same time, he had to resist being manipulated. In one instance, a girl who was sent to a bank for a clerical job wrote on her application that she had two young children who were her dependents. She was not married. The job developer got an angry phone call from the bank's personnel manager, who felt that the moral integrity of the entire bank was threatened by the girl.

The job developer had not known about the children and was displeased that the counselor had witheld the information. The counselor felt the children were the girl's business; their existence should not automatically preclude her from employment. The case prompted a long dialogue among the staff. The job developers held that the girl should be told not to mention the children. The counselors felt they had no right to tell her to deny her own offspring, that this was a choice only she could make.

In many similar instances, employment disabilities turned out to be middle class definitions of social deviance. Naturally enough, these were the thorniest cases for the counselors to deal with. Almost every client understood, and accepted, that if he took off too many days or came late constantly, he would lose the job. However, many of them refused to accept the idea that they were unemployable because of their haircuts, their choice of clothes, their deportment, their children, or their police records. The anger and frustration generated in these situations were very real and were not easily dispelled. The counselors had to avoid being seen as agents of the power structure in order to maintain communication with their clients, understand the implications, and see the choices open to him.

The development of employability did not occur in a vacuum. In many cases, no change in attitude could occur until the youth actually confronted a job situation. The counselors could then make use of the experience itself rather than just talk about a possible situation. This technique can be described under post-placement counseling.

2. Post-Placement and Vocational Counseling - One of our clients with a very low reading grade insisted he be placed in an office. The counselor suggested that this aspiration might be unrealistic, since the client had no clerical experience or skills and could not read well. The counselor suggested remedial help in reading and sessions in one of the office

training shops, with an entry-level job for a start. The client refused, and insisted he was qualified for a clerical position.

The job developer was brought into the discussion to introduce a more realistic attitude, but the youth remained adamant. The job developer told the counselor privately that the youth could not pass a test for a clerical job, and it was his opinion that nothing would be gained by such a referral.

The counselor decided that no progress would be made in counseling until the client accepted a more realistic appraisal of the situation. Consequently, he asked the job developer to send the youth out for interviews for clerical jobs. The youth promised to return whether or not he got a job.

Needless to say, the youth failed the employment tests. He returned the following night, somewhat crestfallen, and talked to the counselor about his disappointment. The counselor was able to use the experience to help the youth reappraise his whole situation. The youth took a job as a messenger, and began working with a tutor to improve his reading skills. He continued to see his counselor and began to make plans to work for a high-school equivalency diploma.

This instance of using the reality of the job world as an aid to counseling describes one facet of post-placement counseling. For clients who have had no previous work experience, this process is often essential in helping the beginner to make long-range plans. The first working experiences of disadvantaged youth can be anticipated as unsatisfactory and disappointing to the youth within a fairly short period of time; taking cognizance of that premise, the JCC counselors urged all their clients to return after they were placed to talk about the job, and to start thinking about the future.

Aside from cushioning the effects of "job shock" on the new entrants to the labor force, post-placement counseling was intended to provide a means for the clients to explore the possibilities of job upgrading and career development. As was anticipated, the numbers of clients who used this service for a significant periodof time were relatively modest compared to the overall population of the four centers. The amount of service provided for working clients tapered off as they adjusted to their jobs, while its importance probably increased in terms of long range progress. Significant changes in our clients took place over an extended period of time, during which counseling sessions were scattered somewhat randomly. A client referred to an evening high school was unlikely to see his counselor as long as things were going well in school; his reappearance at an evening center was usually prompted by a crisis.

The most dramatic progress was attained by those youths who "stuck" with the program for a year or more. Naturally, the measurement of growth was much more obvious in these cases than in those which did not maintain their association for more than a month or so. All the elements of upgrading - acquisition of a skill, edueational improvement, establishment of a work record, maturation of outlook - took months of effort, during which time the counselor played an important part. How important is difficult to say. A sceptical opinion would hold that the clients who stayed with the program and achieved the greatest progress were sufficiently self-motivated to succeed without the program.

This view overlooks, however, a most significant element: the personal relationship of counselor and client. The functions of writing resumes, filling out applications, and investigating educational and vocational opportunities did not take place between a client and an agency; they occurred between a client and one individual. The importance of the relationship cannot be discounted. To make available all the components of a manpower program to disadvantaged youths and to omit a supportive personal relationship would ignore the most damaging disabilities that are subsumed under the "disadvantaged" label.

3. Time and Depth of Counseling - One problem that stayed with us throughout the term of the contract was the elusiveness of the answer to the question, "How long and how deep?" When a youth coming in off the street confused and frustrated was given a sense of direction and a job, had the counselor fulfilled his obligation to provide service? Might it not be unhealthy to encourage the youth to return again and again, perhaps to slide into a dependent situation which would sap his initiative? Was there not a danger of a counselor meeting his own needs and losing sight of his client's welfare?

Adding to the confusion was the constant intake of new clients. All of the counselors were constantly being fed new cases, so that their time was divided between old and new clients. Because the contract stipulated that we would service 2,500 youths, and because the program was open-ended in structure, the flow of new cases was constant and precluded program sequences.

The extensiveness of the counseling was primarily determined by the clients themselves. They were under no obligation to return, nor were they lured by a stipend. The counselors, of course, encouraged the youths to come back, especially in the period of adjustment to a new job. The counselors made periodic contacts with clients they had not seen in some time to assure them of their welcome. The client was always free to come or not, and the counselors communicated their respect of this freedom.

In a few instances, counselors had to suggest a suspension of the counseling relationship. Some youths came to be overly dependent on their counselor, which forced him to correct the situation. The counselor would review the client's status with him, and if they agreed that there were no pressing needs at the moment, the counselor would suggest that the client did not have to see him regularly. In each of these instances, of course, the counselor stressed that the door was always open and the client was always welcome to come back for help.

These cases were rare, but the fact that they did occur occasionally is a positive indication that the counselors were aware of the danger. The in-service training sessions provided the opportunity for counselors to question themselves and their colleagues about their work. The following excerpt comes from one of those sessions. The topic was depth of counseling, and the counselor speaking (a woman, with a background in social casework) was voicing her concern about dependent relationships and suggesting the consideration of referrals to psychiatric treatment:

> I don't want to even intimate that it's the counselor causing the kid to come back or fail; but inherent in this child's personality may be things that the child is looking for that you don't have the answer for, and the kid doesn't have the answer for. Maybe it's inher-

> ent in our work that we get the kid to the source that's going to help the greatest need. My point is, too, that the child has such a basic need to keep returning that I wonder about the value of this.

The existence of the shops and the remedial component influenced the depth of the counseling and its duration. A youth coming to the center twice a week for help in reading could see his counselor from time to time with no therapeutic overtones to the meeting. The sessions could have an accidental or social tone, which in some cases was probably more comfortable to the youth than coming to the center just to talk to a counselor about his problems. The following excerpt, from another meeting and another counselor illustrates this factor:

> I have changed my focus in counseling, to elongate it, rather than as we started out, just to be job focused. I did wonder about the depth of counseling, and I raised all kinds of question marks because I tend to classify, to diagnose tentatively, after hearing some of the client's problems and difficulties. I knew I would be getting into some of their real problems that might be pertinent to the job. And this has happened in my following through with the youngsters that come to see me as a result of their being constantly in our shops.
>
> They feel that it is so important to see me because I have gotten into some of their problems - not related to their job functioning, but which are important to them. So, they feel it a need. One girl comes in and she is talking about a situation with her sister's husband, which is almost like seducing the husband, but this is not affecting her work. She's working, she's earning money, she's going to her shop, she's learning and everything. But, this is a problem with her. If she wasn't coming twice a week for shop, she might not have seen me so frequently. She said she knew she could talk to me, and I didn't close her out, because I don't close out the clients.

This counselor is also a woman with a social casework background. The differences in the two excerpts are not philosophical differences but reflect a major determinant in the counselor's judgment about depth is progress and growth taking place, or is the counselor satisfying his own needs by playing analyst?

The client's judgment about depth, while not so verbal, is much more effective. He comes to a center, or he does not come. A follow-up call from his counselor may help him feel welcome to return, but if he does not want to be counseled, he will stay away. This freedom is the best safety device in a situation which could become manipulative or destructive.

The client's freedom to come or not also had a strong effect on the pace of the counseling. After the client started some activity - a job, a training program, an educational program - his needs were being met and the probability was that he would not come back until something happened to upset him. If the job was at entry-level, the time was usually short.

A great deal of the counselors' dialogue with each other was taken up with how directive or non-directive a counselor should be in this stage. Should he wait until the client became dissatisfied with the entry-level job, and hope the client would return? Or should he be more directive and suggest an upgrading process immediately, through the shops or evening classes?

Both approaches were tried, both with some measure of success. Either way,the client was still free to stay away if he so chose. There were hundreds of youths who dropped out of sight for four or five months and then suddenly appeared one night at their center. Whether or not they were better off for this period of absence varied from client to client, and naturally we feel they would have been better served to stay with the program; however, the counselors were trying to encourage a maturation process, which is an entirely different thing from teaching a skill. We turned out typists a lot faster than we turned out well-adjusted, self-confident young adults.

The program worked at improving the climate in which this maturation process took place, but frequently a client said, by his actions, "You're going too fast for me. I'll be back when I'm ready for the next step."

And as long as he did come back, the counselor had to feel he was making progress. The dramatic breakthroughs that make up a program's best anecdotes were slower in coming and certainly fewer than we had hoped for, as anyone connected with a youth manpower program comes to know. The fact that they do occur is the brightest note a program can produce.

THEME: WHERE HAVE WE BEEN? WHERE ARE WE? WHERE ARE WE GOING..

AGENDA

I. Opening Remarks - Richard Greenfield

II. Discussion Groups:

A. Administrative Counselor and Project Director

Discussion Leader: Arthur Jaffe

Suggested Topics: What techniques are being employed at the different Centers to attract our target population?

What is the role of the Administrative Counselor?

B. Counselor (two groups)

Discussion Leader: Group 1..Margurete Johnson
Group 2..Donald Brown

Suggested Topics: Are group methods applicable to our program and population?

Is our Intake Procedure effective?

C. Job Development Staff and Vocational Education Teachers

Discussion Leaders: Arthur Keleher and Ben Stern

Suggested Topics: How can the job placement and vocational education people work closer together in order to enhance employability.

D. Basic Education People

Discussion Leader: Robert Klenofsky

Suggested Topics: Reading materials which have been effective with our population.
The use of tutors.

E. Secretaries

Discussion Leader: Betty Nash - Charles Soffel

Suggested Topics: Records
Intake Procedures

III. Report back from groups

IV. Discussion from floor.

JOB COUNSELING CENTER
BOARD OF EDUCATION

TO : Staff - All Counselors, Job Developers, Remedial Tchrs. and Tutors

FROM: Richard Greenfield, Project Director

RE : Workshops (Staff Training)

I. For Counselors: 4:00 to 5:30 In the Autditorium

Topic: Post High School Educational Planning For Our Target Population

Panel Discussion:
Professor Irving L. Slade, City University Operation Bridgehead
Mr. Candido De Leon, Director SEEK Program
Dr. George H. Howard, Director
State University Urban Center
Dr. Shirley Chiantoor, Director
College and Career Consultants
Mr. Harold Zuckerman, Coordinator
College Guidance & Scholarship, NYC Board of Educatio

5:30 to 7:00
"The Counseling Record and the strategy of 'Mini-Max'"
Group Leaders: Ben Wolfson, Ruth Hemphill, Marguerite Johnso
Question: What are the minimum entries we can make in the confidential counseling record to achieve a maximum payoff in its usefulness to the counselor?

II. The Basic Ed workshop will be held in room 508. A series of three demonstrations will be given. Discussion and question-answer after each demonstration is planned.

4:00-5:00 - The supervision of sub-professional tutors
Leader: Bob Klenofsky - Maxwell JCC

5:00-6:00 - The organization of materials for maximum individualization of instruction
Leader: Lou Perutti - Gompers JCC

6:00-7:00 - The utilization of ITA with certain segments of our target population
Leader: Ira Landess - Brandeis JCC

TO : Staff - All Counselors, Job Developers, Basic Ed Coordinators, Voc-Ed Teachers
FROM: Richard Greenfield, Project Coordinator
RE : Workshops (Staff Training)

PART I : PANEL DISCUSSION 4:15 to 5:30

TOPIC: The Personnel Man's Viewpoint Participants:

Mr. Edward Alter	W.T. Grant
Mr. Martin Gibberstone	Brookdale Hospital
Mr. Fred Ohrn	Equitable Life
Mr. Herbert Gottlieb	Richard Buick
Mr. John Callahan	U.S. Civil Service Commissic

PART II: SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION 5:45 to 7:00

TOPIC: Reaction to Panel Discussion

GROUP I (RM 511)

ADMINISTRATOR	JOB DEVELOPER	COUNSELORS	BASIC ED. COOR.	VOC-ED TEACHERS
Seymour Weissman	Walter Fitzpatrick Bruce Jackman	Manhattan	Bronx	Queens

GROUP II (RM 513)

ADMINISTRATOR	JOB DEVELOPER	COUNSELORS	BASIC ED. COOR.	VOC-ED
Gerard Wynne	David Kass	Queens	Queens	Manhattan

GROUP III (RM 507)

ADMINISTRATOR	JOB DEVELOPER	COUNSELORS	BASIC ED. COOR.	VOC-ED TEACHERS
Daniel Rubinstein	Melvin Conn	Brooklyn	Brooklyn	Bronx

GROUP IV (RM 512)

ADMINISTRATOR	JOB DEVELOPER	COUNSELORS	BASIC ED. COOR.	VOC-ED TEACHER
Julian Washington	Jay Schindel	Bronx	Manhattan	Brooklyn

JOB COUNSELING CENTER
BOARD OF EDUCATION

COUNSELING RECORD

Counselor ______________________

Client's name ____________________ (last) ____________________ (first) File No. ______________

INITIAL INTERVIEW: ______/______/______ (date)

Comments ____

Tentative goals ____

Immediate steps ____

# # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #

480-JCC-7½M-3/66 134

Board of Education of the City of New York

____
School

STUDENT APPLICATION FOR WITHDRAWL

A. TO BE FILLED OUT BY STUDENT......(Please Print)

Student's Name (Last)_____________(First)_______(Mid)___

Address______________________(Apt.)_____c/o______________

Borough___________________Zip_________Phone______________

Verified by School Secretary_______________

Why do you wish to leave school?_____________________________

____

B. TO BE FILLED OUT BY COUNSELOR:

1. Counselor's Analysis of reasons for withdrawl request:

   ____

   ____

2. Has parent been interviewed with regard to pupils request for withdrawl

   Yes_____ No_____

3. Marketable skills, if any (e.g. typing, shorthand, bookkeeping, trade, etc.

   ____

   ____

4. School problems(reading, behavior, health). Also please note any agency contact;

   ____

   ____

5. Counselor's estimate of pupil's ability to handle academic work

________	________	________	________
Poor	Fair	Good	Unknown

__________________	__________________
Date of Interview	Counselor's Signature

C. TO BE FILLED OUT ONLY IF PUPIL DECIDES TO WITHDRAW.
Grade in School when Discharged(circle one): 7 8 9 10 11 12
Date of Birth: ____________

TESTING RECORD

Date	Type	Name of Test	Grade Level

Date of Discharge__________.Reason for discharge

Mail this Form to:
Job Counseling Center
198 Forsyth Street
New York, New York 10002

JOB COUNSELING CENTER

1. BK___Q___
BX___M___

2. INTAKE DATE:___________
3. COUNSELOR:___________

FILE NO:___________

---

4. NAME________________________
(Please print) last first

5. SEX: M___F___

6. ADDRESS:___________________
7. PHONE___________

8. D.O.B.___________________AGE:___________

---

9. MARITAL STATUS
Married_______
Single_______
Other_______

10. ETHNICITY
N_______
P_______
O_______

11. SS#___________
12. DRAFT STATUS
____
13. REFERRAL
____

FAMILY

14. Living with parents: NO_____
ONE_____
BOTH___

15. Separated_______
Divorced _______

16. Highest grade father completed: Unknown_______

17. Brothers_________
Sisters _________

0-4______
5-8______
9-12_______
12+ _______

---

18. Last School Attended____________
19. Date Left______

20. Highest Grade:
6-7-8-9-10-11-12 Grade
Graduate:___________

21. Reason For Leaving:_________
____

---

22. AGENCIES___________
23. HANDICAP_________________

24. PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE

FIRM	TYPE OF WORK	DURATION

25. HIGHEST WEEKLY SALARY:___________

26. WKS. UNEMPLOYED: Less than 5___ 5-14___15-26___27-52___
AT INTAKE ___________

27. UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE STATUS: Claimant_______________
Non-Claimant___________

28. Comments:

Dear Colleague:

Since some agencies are not familiar with the Job Counseling Center of the Board of Education, the brief description of our program which follows may be of help. In all events your professional staff should feel free to call me at 227-8480 any day between 9 and 4 if more detailed information is needed.

The Job Counseling Center has served the 16 to 21 year old out-of-school unemployed youth since February of 1964. The Center operates under a grant from the Office of Manpower, Automation and Training of the United States Department of Labor.

To-date over 3,000 disadvantaged youth have been involved in our program of counseling, placement counseling, and follow-up. We have used our own resources as well as those of other Board of Education facilities such as the Manpower Development and Training Act "Umbrella", the Trade Extension program, and Day and Evening School programs. To help you make a judgment about the appropriate of referral, the major features of our program are as follows:

1. We believe in rapid job placement since the other components are more effective after the immediate need for employment is met.

2. Our staff are all specially selected licensed Board of Education personnel (counselors, voc-ed teachers, remedial reading specialists, teachers with job development experience.)

3. We do our own job development and placement and have made more than 2500 placements. For many of our youth we have made multiple placements since they have often lost their first jobs.

4. The centers are open in the evening to provide the bulk of service after placement. Almost all youth are working within a week or ten days after intake; this period allows three or four pre-employment counseling sessions.

5. In cases where a referring agency is offering the youth a program of on-going counseling, provisions for consultation as the need is felt by either agency are arranged.

6. The long term aim of the program is to encourage the youth by our post-placement efforts to build on the solid base of present employment thru involvement in a variety of activities leading to his upgrading.

RICHARD GREENFIELD
Project Director

21692 ESSEX SYSTEMS CO., INC., NEW YORK, N. Y. 10017

Job Counseling Center

BOARD OF EDUCATION

1. Bk____ Q____

Bx____ M____

2. INTAKE DATE____/____/____

FILE NO. 1582

3. #. COUNSELOR____

4. NAME____ LAST ____ FIRST

5. M____ F____

6. PHONE____

7. ADDRESS____

8. DOB____/____/____ Age____

9. SS#____

10. Draft____

11. REFERRAL:

Exit Int.: Mail____ Phone____ P/C____ JCC Client____ N/S Agency____

Schl. or Bd. of Ed. Agency____ Other____

/ / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /

12. M____ S____ O____

13. N____ P____ O____

14. Prim. Wage Earner Y____ N____

15. Live with parents: No____ One____ Both____ Comment____

16. Last School: Ele____ JHS____ HS____ Other____ Name of School____

17. Highest Grade Complete: 6-7-8-9-10-11-12

18. H.S. Grad.: Y____ N____

19. Time out of school (in months)____

20. PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE: None____

Time since last job (in months)____

List last job first:

Name of employer, or type business	Job Title	Weekly Salary	Duration (in mos.)

21. STATUS AT INTAKE: Employed____ Unemployed____

Underemployed: Part time____ D/E Job____ Other____

22. PRIMARY EXPERIENCES AND SKILLS:

23. HINDRANCES TO EMPLOYMENT:

FINAL REPORT - REMEDIAL READING

OUTLINE

A. Introduction

B. The Use of Tutors

C. Speech Correction

D. Materials for Remediation

E. Coordination with Program Goals

F. Evaluation

....

A. Introduction

The need for help in reading among disadvantaged youths has long been recognized; the dispute continues as to what can be done about it. The JCC had the services of remedial experts from the school system who worked in the evening centers to offer their contribution to the alleviation of reading disabilities. Their experience indicates that remediation is a long, arduous process, and success is determined primarily by the youth's motivation and his ability to overcome the emotional factors which inhibit learning.

Attendance in the reading program was voluntary and unpaid, as was true of the other components. Because of this factor, and because the program was oriented toward employment, only about eight per cent of the total population was involved in the reading component (this excludes those youths who were tested but who did not continue for remediation).

For those who came to reading progress could be seen in proportion to the length of time invested. Our experience with tutors was limited but positive, leading us to recommend their inclusion in any future program.

On a limited budget, the choice of materials seems to be less important than the skill of the instructor to modify what is available to meet the individual needs of his pupils.

The correction of serious reading disabilities requires the youth to invest probably at least a year of his time. Most of our target population would not make that investment. Their needs were immediate, and their tolerance for long-term learning was low. We did not find a way to motivate large numbers of our clients toward the reading program; perhaps this was partly due to the fact that we did not have a large enough reading staff to handle large numbers, but it is more likely that the youths themselves preferred activities, such as jobs, with immediate rewards.

B. The Use of Tutors

The contract had no provision for paying tutors. In three of the centers, the reading teachers worked alone for most of the eighteen months, dividing their time between giving reading tests and providing remedial help. The fourth center had college students assigned to it as tutors and was able to provide more individual help than the other three.

The majority of the JCC clients had been exposed to school and reading instruction for years. With the exception of immigrants with a limited knowledge of English, the clients with reading disabilities had never been able to overcome them in a school situation. Therefore, we could anticipate that a remedial program had to compensate for many factors besides ignorance. When we used tutors, we had to sensitize them to some of the problems of the target population, in addition to teaching them the skills of tutoring. The following excerpt from a conference of the reading teachers quotes the teacher who had tutors in his center:

> When the tutors came to the center, they were inadequate in every aspect of understanding reading. They had no knowledge at all of reading, they had no knowledge at all of the educational disadvantages and problems of poor readers. It was necessary to fill them in and this was done through a series of orientation lessons before they actually started to teach.
>
> It was emphasized to them that more important than the technical mastering of the fundamentals of reading instruction was the maintenance of a relationship, because everything would take place within that relationship. Unless these tutors could regard the clients that they were working with as people who, like themselves, had problems, we could not get off to a right start.
>
> First there was a question of the meaning of dropout. I went into a little lecture explaining in most cases they were not dropouts, but they were push-outs, or kick-outs, and that they very rarely dropped back into the schools again. Then we gave them several case studies of kids who dropped out of school because of reading problems. We discussed a case study. It wasn't a fictitious one, it was a real one. I was using case studies from students I had worked with, and whom I had written about in educational magazines, We used this as a springboard for discussions.

Following this orientation, the tutors were assigned specific clients to work with in order to maximize the effectiveness of the personal relationships that were seen to be the key to providing remedial help. The one-to-one system, despite its obvious advantages to rotating assignments, had some built-in problems because of the flexibility of the evening program. Clients were not paid to come to the centers for any of the supportive services we offered, nor were they threatened for non-attendance. The voluntary nature of the clients' participation in the program was intentional, but it did cause some problems in scheduling.

In the centers which did not enjoy the luxury of a tutorial staff, the reading teachers devised various methods of compensating for the impossibility of their being immediately available for individual help. They assigned private work, or they had several clients work together. The point is that both systems had to come to grips with casual attendance and uneven demands on available time, and both systems managed to honor the program's commitment to the clients' freedom to come and go.

One of the problems that concerned the demands on a teacher's time was the administration of reading tests for new clients. For the teachers without tutors, taking time out from teaching to administer a test was especially frustrating. One of the centers managed to obtain the services of tutors near the end of the program, and the reading teacher immediately taught them to administer the tests for new clients. This function seems to be a good starting place for tutors, especially when they have no prior training in remedial work. In the following quote, the reading teacher describes his experience of using the tutors in this capacity:

> I was going to make a point about the testing. I have four or five tutors now and they are terrific in terms of testing and screening. I rarely do any kind of screening now. I've gone over it with them, - how to do it, what kind of results they can expect, what they feel when they first begin to sit with the clients. The tutors can do it even better than we can.
>
> These tutors are kids very much like the kids who are being tutored only they are a little bit brighter. They can say certain things that will very easily be accepted, things that with us might sound bossy or pushy. Within a few minutes the tutors have the kids with their jackets off, explaining to them what they have to do, and the kids who have to be tested explain back what they think they have to do, so any uncertainties are resolved before they start.

The availability of tutors in the reading program had two distinct advantages: it involved the clients in a supportive relationship at almost a peer level, and it freed the reading teacher from a variety of non-teaching activities.

The tutors also increased the capacity of the reading program to provide remedial service, although that fact of itself did not mean that more clients were involved in remediation. We had assumed that the presence of tutors would result in a more effective reading program, in terms of numbers served and measurable progress achieved, but the records do not justify this assumption. The perception of the counselors was that the tutoring relationship was a positive experience for the youths involved, but we can not say that it provided any new or quick solutions to the problem of reading retardation.

The teacher who had the tutors at his center commented on the technical problems that made tutoring difficult, and the need for careful selection and training of tutors:

> It is definitely possible to teach a person-an adult who has never learned to read, not a clinical case-to learn to read, if the materials that are being used have been programmed adequately. However, if you are working with a kid who has a number of psychological problems, who has learning disabilities which may prevent him from picking up things that are thrown at him quickly, it becomes necessary for the tutor to modify continually what he is doing. Then, I think the need is there for a person who is trained more adequately.
>
> What you have to do here is define what you mean when you say any bright person can take over and do as good a job (as a trained remediation expert). I'll agree that he can do a very fine job with certain types of problems. For example, if a kid is reading at the seventh grade level, you take a bright youngster and I am sure that he can accimplish a great deal. The problem there is not nearly as acute as one in which a person doesn't even know how to blend.

C. Speech Correction

The reading teachers haf to cope with speech defects as well as reading problems. Many of the youths had dialect errors; others were learning English as a second language. Both of these problems affected their reading ability and, ultimately, their employability. The reading teacher quoted here indicates how this problems was perceived in his program:

> As we got on with the program, we became a little more sophisticated and recognized that the reading problem as it was thought about initially was wrong. We became very much aware of the need for speech help correlated with reading.
>
> Many of the youngsters had come from the south, and they had dialect errors. Misprounciations were projected to the printed page. It became necessary for the tutors not to be so eager to immediately rush into the teaching of reading. In some cases, it became necessary for the boys and girls who had the problem to get the feel of what is meant by standard English.
>
> We became very much awarc that even if we improved the reading level of these kids we would still fail because the end of the program was to enhance employability. If we improved the reading and the kid went for a job but didn't get it because of dialect errors, we realized that we would not have fulfilled our job. Therefore we had to correlate the teaching of reading with language and speech.

One of the reading teachers spoke Spanish. Some of the youths in that center who came from South and Central America worked with him to overcome their language barriers. Most of these clients came from a middle class backgroung; yet, being new to the country and having a language problem, they had similar disabilities to our indigenous target population. Unlike our indigenous clients, how-ever, they could over come the disabilities by learning the language. They were better equipped. culturally and eeducationally, to complete in the job market. A commandof English was followed by a disap-[illegible], the [illegible].

[illegible] youths brought [illegible] the South [illegible] pearance of the traits of disadvantagedness - the shyness, the uncertainty, the poor self-image.

These youths brought home to us the depth of the problems besetting our indigenous clients. We realized again that there was no easy way to compensate for a totally inadequate educati especially when the client had black skin. Undoubtedly, some of the youths knew this better than we did.

D. Materials for Remediation

The teacher with the tutors had been with the JCC during the previous year. He had a doctorate in reading, and since he had experience with the program, he ordered much of the material. The other teachers were encouraged to choose those books they wanted from the stockpile, and to order any particular texts they were familiar with.

Since each of them did remedial work on their full-time job in the schools, they ere familiar with the available books and aids. They were encouraged to develop their own curriculum and materials, working from the strength of their individual expertise. The teacher who came in near the end of the contac period is quoted here on his method of organization:

> When I came in, another new teacher and I went through the material together, and we didn't like anything that was there. We took out the SRA (Science Research Associates) material and used that. I finally went back to my day school, where I had materials from Continental Pres for the third, fourth, and fifth grade levels. I took a book called Effective Reading, by Weinstein, and memographed materials from there.
>
> I had no clear idea of the entire program - just to teach reading? or was it just to getthese kids jobs. Well, I knew my objective was to get in as many as I could and teach them, to find our approximately where they were and give them some kind of material.

> The first step was to give them a Metropolitan Intermediate Test. That gave me a general idea of their grade level, and from there I went into the materials.
>
> It works out now that each student who comes in is given a folder. I have their reading test on the left-hand side. After they are tested, they know approximately where they are and what kind of assistance they need. On the right-hand side are some of the materials I have prepared.
>
> I have been averaging about twelve to fifteen kids a night, from CRMD up to tenth grade level. My objective at this point was to give these kids some kind of materials. Whoever came in first usually had two exercises to do plus a little note, "If I am busy, work on this or that." Then I would just move around, helping them as they finished. But there was such tremendous diversity. It's almost impossible to work with fifteen kids and give reading tests on the side. The only way out was to give them materials to work with.
>
> Some of the material, like The Job Ahead, is too advanced for many of our kids. I don't even think they were able to follow it. So I took the materials down. But as far as getting them set for a job, I don't know if I am doing that.

Another teacher talks about his use of materials and his method of testing to establish a starting point:

> Primarily, I have been using the Reader's Digest Series (Reading Skill Builder Series). I find that it is very effective because to the kids it is not a series of baby books. These kids have had reader after reader, workbook after workbook in the regular school before they were pushed out.
>
> The Reader's Digest Series seems to have a good holding power. It's constructive. It is a structured sort of material; it progresses from part to part. I don't have a complete series, but I try to keep it structured by following the sequence with what I have.
>
> I found a test that's great. Instead of waiting for the half hour or three quarters of an hour that the Metropolitan Achievement takes, I have been using the Gates Reading Survey, which is a five minute test. The Gates is almost as accurate in the five to ten minutes period as the Metropolitan in the half hour or three quarters of an hour period. It gives me an idea where the kid is, and I can start at the kid's level. Sometimes it's good to start at a half-level or a level lower so that it is not difficult for them to begin.

8

The remedial reading components of the four evening centers developed separate styles, techniques, and materials under separate leadership and in response to varying needs of the population being served. From time to time, discussions were held on whether or not coordination of the four programs would produce better results. Partly by choice and partly by necessity, the reading teachers worked independently. The program relied on their training and experience to provide effective remediation within their centers.

During the final conference of reading teachers, the teacher who had been with us for two and a half years was asked what contributions a coordinator could make in this type of program:

> I would envision a coordinator who is working full-time to try to arrange for monthly meetings at which time the members of all the centers could get together and share various viewpoints. The one thing that I felt was lacking since I have been in the program was communication among the various teachers. So, to me this is a number one factor.
>
> As far as materials are concerned, the people who are working in the program have enough competence to know what materials they want. I don't think that everyone should be put into a mold and get materials that a coordinator thinks are best. The individual needs or requirements for materials should be respected. A coordinator should order materials in harmony with the particular philosophy that a particular reading man has.
>
> I have always believed that materials don't really mean that much. They are important, but if you have a good man at the top, he won't place too much emphasis on materials. The best materials are those that are made up, tailored, under the direction of the reading head.
>
> I've thought that most of the materials we had were inadequate. Most of them have marked limitations, and they have to be modified. The best materials we have here frequently must be modified in harmony with certain problems that the kid has, and I think that a person who is in charge should recognize that. The people at the centers should be responsible for doing this sort of thing. If a coordinator did the modifying, I think it would be taking

something away from the centers.

E. Coordination with Program Goals

The reading components made their specialized contributions to the JCC's overall function of enhancing employability. Our aim was to keep the youth employed during a period of exploration and decision-making, and the reading program was part of the process. Although we do not have any clear statistical evidence, we know that many of the youngsters who decided to return to school or seek an equivalency diploma were motivated by their experience in the reading program.

The reading teachers and the tutors encouraged these academic moves, since this was their sphere of influence rather than the area of job performance. Hence this quote from one of of the teachers:

> In reference to reading, I have moved beyond the goal that we're teaching these kids reading just to get a job. My philosophy is to raise their reading level not just for a job opportunity, but to encourage them either to go back to school or maybe to go up to the high school equivalency class.

It was the counselors' obligation to help the youths to evaluate the various activities in which they were engaged, so that vocational or educational choices would be seen clearly in the light of the youths' experience. This process relied almost entirely on the youths' perception as it came out in counseling sessions, rather than a series of evaluations from other staff members. Communication between counselors and reading teachers and tutors was limited by the counselors' workload and shortage of free time.

From a counseling point of view, a case can be made that nothing more is needed beyond the client's perception for effective counseling to take place. However, this does not remove the obvious short-conings of the system as it worked out. Some of the counselors made considerable efforts to keep informed on their clients' progress in the reading classes and the shops, and were able to do it; however, there was no system for this exchange of information, and that was a mistake.

A reading teacher describes here the method of communication in the center which had the tutors:

> Some of the counselors would sometimes sit in at eight-thirty and listen to the information that the tutors picked up. They would go away with a greater insight about the problems of these kids, insight which they hadn' picked up themselves.
>
> Some of our tutors would go over to the counselors and say,- Give me some background information on these kids, and Miss ______ would often give certain information that these kids couldn't pick up by themselves, especially psychological information.
>
> So, there was a give and take. There wasn't as much as I would have liked to have seen, but that wasn't the counselors' fault. These kids became so involved in the reading program that the counselors felt in some cases that it would be better for them to get as much as they could out of the reading program.

The teacher seems to be saying here that the counselors did not want to intrude in the tutorial relationship. This attitude reflects the absence of an information exchange system and the hesitancy with which fill-in systems were approached.

The assumption was made that if a client was coming to a center regularly for reading help, he was involved in a positive activity. The counselors' time was spent responding to the more intense pressures put on them by their clients who were not working, or who suddenly stopped coming to the centers.

The initiative for communication remained with the counselors; when they did not take that initiative, the people in the reading program functioned independently. The demands of running the centers kept everyone busy, so that the problems caused by poor communication were worked around rather than solved. The staff members were expert enough in their own fields to continue to provide service despite occasional feelings of detachment or alienation. Again, the major thrust of the program was toward the counseling relationship and employment; as important as the remedial services were, they did not command the time and attention that were given to counseling and placement

F. Evaluation

The reading teachers did not set up a series of evaluative tests to monitor the progress of their clients. An initial test established the reading level of the youth, and from there the teacher began to work with him. Progress was noted individually as the youth mastered the fundamentals and moved to new materials. The teachers felt testing to measure progress was a bureaucratic or statistical device that offered nothing to the youths' learning process.

Toward the end of the contract period, evaluative tests were given for this report. A table is appended to this section to indicate the sort of statistical progress that can be expected of a voluntary, part-time program of this sort. One of the teachers reports what he found in his evaluation:

> I was told that we were going to have some sort of evaluation, and so at that point I started to retest kids who had been coming for some time. It was the second test that I had ever given them, and I found that for every month the kid had attended my center, he had grown an average of three to four months on his reading level.

The reluctance of the teachers to rely on test scores as the sole evaluative instrument came in part from their experience in the remedial field, as shown in this exchange:

A: When we think of progress, we have to be a little more tentative (than relying on test scores). My experience in the daytime has been in working with students whose reading level is below the third grade. Over a period of time, their progress as far as measurement on a standardized reading test shows is less than a student's who has been in the program for the same length of time and whose reading level is between three and six. Now, if you take a student who starts out initially at the sixth grade level and you estimate his progress as measured on a standardized reading test for a comparable length of time, you will find that the progress that that student makes is almost three times as much as the progress made by a student whose reading level initially is third grade.

B: I completely agree with you; I find that in my day school program also. But I feel that the kid who has been reading at the first or second grade level, who jumps to three or three-point five, is really making progress and has travelled a long distance. From the time he has been in second grade he has stayed at preprimer or second grade. In my corrective reading program, he jumped from second grade to three-point-five. This kid has made a year and one-half progress, whereas in the previous five years he had made a month or two progress per year, if any at all. If you worked out some sort of a curve, I feel it would show that this kid has made a terrific improvement.

A: I would like to tie in the emotional aspects. The normal kid has to be in school for a period of two years before he learns to read at the second grade level. Compare this situation to that of an adolescent who has many psychological problems and who comes to you as a complete zero reader. If you have him for a year, and you see that in that year he makes close to a year's progress, I think in some respects this could be phenomenal. You are working with so many psychological problems of frustration that have festered over all these years during which, although he has been exposed to some kinds of remediation, he still has not learned to read.

You have taken this person on a one-to-one relationship and brought him from a point of complete illiteracy as far as reading is concerned, to a point which statistically may not be very high, but which is tremendous compared to the rate of learning in the preceding seven or eight years. So, in a ratio comparison, he has made tremendous progress.

Getting on to other emotional factors. There is no doubt in my mind or in the tutors' minds that all of the kids, regardless of the severity of their reading problems, have shown greater self-confidence, a greater respect of themselves, a recognition of themselves as people who can succeed, as a result of whatever small increments of success they have made in the period of time they have been with us.

For example, we have a kid who has been with us for a year. We just got through estimating the number of sessions he came to us, and I think it was fifty-four. He came to us as a non-reader. He still is a non-reader. This is a very, very severe case.

We remembered him when he first came to the program. He used to hold his head down, ashamed of himself. Now he comes to us with his brother. He's always rather confident that he is going to succeed, although he is still a non-reader. He has learned to recognize letters, to sound them out. He is in the process now of learning to blend these letters. He can recognize about a hundred or so basic sight words. It's very painful. He hasn't got that independence of word recognition which is why it is so hard to get to him. But the fact is that he is learning, and he himself must feel that he is making progress because in the year's time that he has been coming to us he has seldom missed a lesson.

STUDENTS WHO STAYED WITH THE READING PROGRAM 6 MONTHS OR MORE

June 13, 1966

STUDENT	INITIAL RDG. GRADE	FINAL RDG. GRADE
Bifulco, Anthony	Non-reader	2.0
Bifulco, Carmine	Non-reader	Non-reader
Merola, Terry	4.0	6.0
Gregg, David	Non-reader	Non-reader
Nuzzo, John	Non-reader	2.5
Sullivan, Elizabeth	4.0	6.5
Bonafous, Carmen	2.0	4.5
Vargas, Christine	4.5	8.0
Fuller, Henry	3.0	5.5
Fuller, Arthur	3.0	5.0
Evans, James	1.5	3.5
Houston, Jo Anne	Non-reader	1.5
McCormack, Frank	1.5	3.5
Gooding, Stephen	2.0	4.5
Husted, Don	3.5	5.8

All final reading scores which are below 6.0 are based on the Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty.

Scores of 6.0 and above are based on the Nelson Reading Test Forms A and B.

Dr. Harold Newman, Instructor

FINAL REPORT - TRY-OUT SHOPS

OUTLINE

A. Introduction

B. Philosophy and Development of try-out shops
    1. exploratory
    2. vestibule
    3. holding device (for counselors and training cycles)

C. Availability
    1. instant access
    2. open-ended
    3. individual instruction

D. Success and Failure
    1. commercial shops
    2. industrial shops
    3. high school equivalency courses

. . . .

A. INTRODUCTION

The shop program was a hybrid offspring of try-out philosophy and training need. Because facilities were limited in each center to two or three possible shops, a complete try-out program was impossible. The unpaid, part-time shop sessions did not qualify as legitimate training programs. Nevertheless, the shop program made its unique contribution to the overall program, and in fact did turn up its modest share of success stories.

The flexibility and informality of the instruction in the shops was a result of our recognition of the special needs of the target population. We tried to avoid rigidity and competition in the belief that our clients had been surfeited with those two commodities to no noticeable benefit. We had to be different from a school, and still provide real service to the youths who came to us for help.

The shops in the commercial subjects had strong appeal to the youths, in line with the prestige of office jobs. Movement from a factory to an office was the most common means of upgrading we could provide in employment, and the commercial shops were the vehicles.

The industrial shops - auto repair and garment machine operation - could not provide enough training to qualify our clients for related jobs. This shortcoming remained with us throughout the contract period, forcing us to seek out other training programs for industrial skills. To date, we have found no job market for short-term trainees.

B. The Philosophy and Development of Try-Out Shops

As originally described in the proposal, the try-out shops were not intended to be training facilities. The Vocational Education Division of the Board of Education resisted any suggestion that the JCC be empowered to offer training at school facilities, and so the idea of vocational try-out became part of the JCC vocabulary during its earliest days. Yet, the need for training existed among JCC clients, training which was available and rewarding. The tug-of-war that ensued between the proposal definition of try-out and the need for training stayed with the program for its duration. In theory and in practice, the shops were both training and try-out facilities.

The idea of vocational try-out facilities in the evening centers was based in part on the desire to extend the range of the counseling. Since the counselors were to help their clients evaluate their experiences in a variety of areas, we wanted to have at hand a number of different experiences, rather than have to send clients to other facilities and hope they would return.

These experiences had three primary functions:

B.1 - Exploratory

Going on the assumption that vocational choices for our target population were usually random and haphazard, the JCC tried to offer a series of exploratory experiences which would allow a basis for counseling discussions of vocational possibilities. Two problems impeded a full implementation of this thesis: the cost factor, and the availability of suitable facilities in our centers.

We could not maintain shops unless a reasonable number of clients were attending them, so our choice was narrowed to the more popular vocational fields. Where our centers were located in commercial high schools, industrial shops were automatically precluded. The reverse was generally true, although we did move typewriters into two non-commercial schools to extend the range of shops.

The most fully utilized center offered a choice of three shops. The choices, then, were somewhat limited. Our definition of exploration was, of course, modified to reflect the narrow range of our actual shop operation.

B.2 - Vestibule

Within the JCC, the term 'vestibule facility' reflected our belief that many of our clients were not ready for institutional training, and that a period of preparation and encouragement was needed to build up their tolerance for that training.

The instructors in charge of the try-out shops were oriented toward that belief, and the activity in the shops followed it.

We were extremely conscious of the negative experiences that most of our clients had undergone in the school system. With possibly one or two exceptions, the shop instructors welcomed the opportunity to offer a course of instruction that was not competitive or geared to an established curriculum. They did not grade their pupils, nor hold them to an accepted rate of progress; they concentrated on acceptance of their pupils, and a communication of the value of their particular subject matter.

The choice of instructors was extremely important. Almost all our clients were under-achievers in the broadest sense, and the instructors had to be satisfied with a degree of success that recognized the shortcomings of their pupils' past experiences. We had very few diamonds in the rough.

It was gratifying, for a Board of Education program, to discover a wealth of talent that had the requisite empathy and patience to be accepted by our target population, and to be perceived by them as sources of legitimate help.

The shop experience often led to activities not connected with the training. Some of the youths, because of the encouragement they received, were motivated to return to school or to seek training in a different field. The goals of the try-out program were considerably broader than the skill area of each shop.

B.3 - Holding Device

Formal training programs, such as those in MDTA, present problems in timing for referring agencies. The question was how to sustain a youth's motivation when the activity he chose, whether it were training or a return to school, was not immediately available because of starting dates. The counselors recommended to many of their clients who were in this situation attendance in one of the shops of classes as a fill-in activity.

This activity was far more than busy work, even though the amount of training the youth received may not have been extensive enough even to be called training. The counselors knew that if a youth said in November that he wanted to return to school in February, he needed support and encouragement in the intervening period. If the counselor merely told the youth to come back in February, the chances were that he would never see the youth again. In a sense, attendance in the shop or class then became a symbole of the youth's resolution. It also kept the youth in contact with his counselor.

The last point was also significant with some clients who were not waiting for starting dates of outside activities. Attendance in the shops meant that the youth would have more occasion to see his counselor. He did not have to make a special trip to the center when he wanted to talk about something. For those clients who were not ready for employment, the shops provided a degree of conditioning and preparation while the counseling process was taking place.

From a counseling point of view, especially for the least able clients, progress was directly related to attendance in a center.

The more often a youth came to a center, the more opportunity the program had as a whole to provide real service. The try-out shops expanded the appeal of the program and its image as a source of total service.

C. Availablity of Try-Out Shops

Taking advantage of its status as an experimental program, the JCC strove for flexibility in all its components. The key word was service, and the key element was movement. If the spirit was competitive, the competition was directed against the institutional rigidity that we felt had been a negative factor in the past experiences of our target population.

The shop program was designed and operated in this striving for flexibility. We did not want classes; we wanted try-out and training facilities that were non-competitive, imaginative, and flexible.

C.1 - Instant Access

All of the shops had open enrollment. A new client could enter any of them at any time without breaking in on a structured curriculum. The instructors made quick evaluations of new clients and started them working at whatever skill level they were capable of handling.

Entry into one of the shops was kept an informal process. When a client expressed an interest or a willingness to take a look at a shop, the counselor accompaned him there and introduced him to the instructor. Naturally, the instructor tried to motivate the youth to attend the sessions regularly, but the option remained with the youth to come or not. What was emphasized was the availability of the shops and the flexibility of instruction, rather than a course of study that followed a calendar. As with the other components, the try-out shops paid no stipends for attendance.

Individual case records indicate that a sizeable number of youths who attended the try-out shops shortly after coming into the program stopped coming after they were placed on jobs. It is obvious that for these youths no training took place; however, we are not able to make blanket value judgments on their experience in the shops. In terms of the try-out philosophy, we can say that these clients moved into a shop quickly, explored a skill area, experienced the encouragement and support of an instructor, and then moved out to another activity.

C.2 - Open-Ended Instruction

The shops had no cycles. A client stayed as long as he wished, and progressed as far as he wished. The instructors taught at all levels, depending on the skill of the clients. If a youth stayed away from a shop for a month or two and then returned, the instructor picked him up where he left off and continued.

This flexibility of instruction was maintained to discourage the youths from dropping the shop because they had missed a lesson and would have to make up what they had missed. Again, the object was to avoid institutional rigidity and the competition that is inherent in a training program that pits a disadvantaged youth against other youths or against a curriculum.

C.3 - Individual Instruction

Trainees progressed at their own rate of speed. The instructors worked separately with each youth to overcome any problems encountered during training. The personal relationships that were formed in the shops between instructors and trainees served to encourage the youths and support them in the training process.

Part of the instructors' job was to explain to each trainee the vocational opportunities that existed in each of the skills being taught, and to give an overall view of what was expected by an employer. The trainees were free to discuss their past experiences and their expectations, and to share their feelings with the other trainees.

The informality and the fraternization that existed in the shops were considered essential in motivating the trainees. The instructors had to provide a supportive environment along with the skills they were teaching. Because of the individual instruction, many problems came to light which might have been overlooked in a class situation. For initial training experiences like the try-out shops, this kind of one-to-one involvement proved to be effective and rewarding.

D. Success and Failure

D.1 - Commercial Shops

Each of the centers had a typing class. Typing was a salable skill, it was attractive to the youths, and training facilities were available. In addition, progress was easily measured and it was linked to the reward of a job after the attainment of a clearly defined skill level (usually a speed of forty words per minute).

The center with the fullest complement of commercial shops had 265 youths in its typing shops during the contract period.

A total of 177 sessions were conducted, with attendance as follows:

Attendance	No. of Sessions
10 or fewer	64
11 - 20	88
21 - 30	5

Unfortunately, no accurate records were kept on the number of trainees who got jobs as typists. Placement was going on before, during, and after training, and the placement records were kept independent of other program activities. However, we know that the majority of clients who attended the typing shops and were placed on related jobs were youths who had had typing experience in school, and who used the typing shops to sharpen their skill.

Skill in typing was affected by reading grades, spelling ability, and mastery of vocabulary. Employment tests were structured to identify these disabilities, in addition to testing speed. We had scores of youths who tested well in our shops but who failed employment tests. Nervousness was of course a factor, but it was obvious that the screening was based on more than manual dexterity.

Aspirations toward office jobs were common among our clients especially among the girls (68% of all clerical jobs went to girls). The two centers offering shops in office machines were attended by many of the typing trainees. Motivation for clerical training was always high, at times even unrealistic, but it was recognized by the staff as a positive force.

It was encouraged by the counselors and the instructors of the commercial shops, but in many cases it remained unrelated to the prospects of actual employment in the clerical field.

No client was refused entry into one of the commercial shops. Attendance had positive values, but it did not guarantee a job in a related field. The job developers used regular shop attendance as a selling point to employers, but this practice did not result in any broad changes in hiring policies. The problem still remained to develop marketable skills, and success occurred with the relatively minor portion of the trainees who had had prior experience in school.

One of the centers ran a key-punch training shop. Like the typing shops, it had prestige, and the equipment was available at no additional cost. Unlike typing, however, key-punch operation is not very salable in New York City. The shop was discontinued when it finally became obvious that no entry-level jobs were available to the trainees.

In general, commercial training on a part-time basis has proved to be a good holding device, a good motivating factor, and a good refresher facility. Except for a few cases, however, it has not solved the problem of providing a salable skill to untrained youths.

D.2 - Industrial Shops

The history of the industrial try-out shops is bleaker than that of the commercial shops in terms of related jobs. Two experiments in auto shops were abandoned after the job developers were unsuccessful in turning up suitable entry jobs for the trainees.

The need for mechanical training for boys remained acute throughout contract period, but we could not discover any rewarding short-term training courses that would at least start our clients on jobs with career potential. We had to rely on institutional training courses and Trade Extension Courses offered in the high schools for those of our clients who sought industrial skills. Of course, our affiliation with the Board of Education facilitated referrals into its training programs by cutting red tape; however, as with all "outside" referrals, we had little control once the client began training.

D.3 - High School Equivalency Courses

Toward the end of the program, our concern for our untrained male clients led us to the inception of preparatory classes for the High School Equivalency Diploma Examination. Response to recruitment notices was enthusiatic, and the degree of motivation was high. The classes were not in operation long enough to evaluate them in terms of numbers of successful applicants, but some positive indications were manifested, and we plan to continue the courses under new funding.

The expected problems of structuring the classes and selecting teaching materials cropped up quickly, and are right now in the process of being worked through. Ideally, a class of ten or fifteen youths would together for a period of time, progressing as a group. This involves a selection process which is alien to the JCC philosophy, because it would screen out the less able readers and those who missed the starting dates. A more flexible system is likely to prevail, at least in those centers with a wide range of applicants.

OUTSIDE SERVICES

A. Introduction

B. The School System
    1. Return to school
    2. Special Services

C. ES and MDTA

D. Community Agencies

E. Special Programs
    1. Comeback
    2. Carpet Training
    3. Headstart
    4. NYC

. . . .

A. Introduction

The youths who came to us for service had such a diversity of strengths and weaknesses that no one formula for success could be applied. As the program progressed, the counselors increasingly demanded a range of services for their clients that the program could not possibly supply by itself. Needs for training, for education, for options to dead-end jobs became more and more important as the staff gained sophistication in its self-evaluation.

The schools were still there, and training programs were available. But what was needed was the technique of effecting successful referrals by cutting through red tape, and the uncovering those of special opportunities for special cases.

Because the program was primarily part-time, and because of its limited resources, the staff did not hesitate to rely on outside services. The job developers, who worked full-time, developed relationships with other agencies and training programs that could be of service to our clients.

The counselors, who worked in the schools during the day, sought out opportunities within the school system for their JCC clients.

The result of all this activity was a tremendous broadening of the opportunities available to our clients. We began to be able to put together packages of service which were tailored to individual needs. We began to approximate the goal of total service.

B. The School System

The Board of Education of the City of New York has publicly acknowledged its obligations to the out of school population from which the JCC drew its clients. These obligations include the provision of special services beyond classroom instruction, and a receptivity to those youths who desire to return to school to complete their high school education.

The JCC, because of its official status as an agency of the Board of Education, was in a unique position to utilize the services of the school system for its clients. Knowledge of the organization enabled us to manuever confidently in our dealings with schools and other school agencies. The entanglements of red tape were often avoided by a phone call to the right person.

B.1 - Return to School

The problems facing a youth who has been officially discharged from school and who desires to return are usually difficult. The situation sometimes reveals a paradox: the Board encourages a return to school, but some of the schools themselves are generally reluctant to admit returnees.

Variable factors, like the youth's age, time out of school, and reason for discharge, have an effect on the severity of the problems of reentry, but the problems always exist.

The intercession of a third party is, at times, essential. The JCC, because of its knowledge of the system, successfully moved several hundred youths back into school by the use of two primary levers: application of the Board's stated policy on retunees, and personal relationships with school personnel.

Typically, the process included a letter to the school which quoted the position of the Board, verified that the youth had been a client of the JCC for a period of time, and concluded that it was the professional opinion of the JCC counselor that the youth was "ready" to function adequately in a school setting. The second lever usually involved a phone call to a school counselor, admittance officer, or a principal known to the JCC counselor. Needless to say, the second lever was often invaluable.

Perhaps it should be stated here that we did not blindly encourage all our clients to return to school. This decision was up to the client. The counselors clarified the options that were available - a job, training, return to school, etc., - and the youth made his choice. The counselors did not force their clients to return to school; in fact, they did not have to.

We do not know how successful non-school agencies were in this area, but we do know that being part of the system and knowing people in the schools gave us an obvious and significant advantage.

B.2 - Special Services

The school system provided many other services to youths not in day school, all of which we utilized. Evening high schools, Trade Extension Courses, Adult Education classes, higher education advisory services, were included in the available options for our clients. The function of the JCC counselors included putting together several options for their clients to make up a package of total service.

The program could and did provide its clients with jobs, but the integration of other services aimed at alleviating disabilities or improving education was a much more desire package. The services were available, but out clients did not always know of them or how to apply for them. Again, the JCC position within the school system increased its knowledge of available services and the mechanics of entry.

The requirements governing admittance to the Trade Extension Courses stipulated that a youth had to be working in the trade before he could qualify for additional training. On its face value, this stipulation automatically excluded most of the youths who came to us seeking specific skills training, because most of them could not get a job in that trade area with no experience.

Because of personal contacts in the evening trade schools, JCC counselors found a way to circumvent this restriction. A youth could be placed in an entry-level job - porter of messenger - with a firm whose line of business the youth wanted to learn.

His application to the Trade Extension Course was then passed on favorably by the counselor's contact, and the youth was admitted.

We constantly used all the resources at our disposal to help our clients, and when we had the advantage of personal contacts, we used that advantage fully.

C. The Employment Service and MDTA

The major MDTA programs for disadvantaged youths were part of a structure called the Umbrella. Screening for these training programs was conducted by the ES. The problem for our clients, which is common to all large training programs, was the time lag between referral and actual entry into the program.

Since the training was conducted by Board of Education personnel, we were kept informed of opening dates and available slots. This knowledge allowed us to push applicants through the screening process in spite of delays. If our clients met with no success in the screening process, they were told to get the name of the ES interviewer and call us immediately. Most of the time, the delay was handled by a phone call from a job developer to the interviewer.

Toward the end of the program, the ES accepted our test scores in reading and math, and the screening process was accelerated considerably. This was most beneficial, because our counselors began to have confidence that their clients would actually enter training, and not bog down in a bureaucratic maze of red tape. This confidence was communicated to the youths, and the rate of referrals increased dramatically.

D. Community Agencies

Each of the four evening centers worked within its community to improve the community package of human services. The cooperation had two distinct purposes; to offer our services to eligible youths in the community, and to seek out new opportunities for our clients. Our placement unit was instrumental in establishing lines of cooperation, since many community agencies were not equipped to develop jobs in private employment.

The bulk of this activity took place during the last eight months of the contract period. It was then that community action groups began to emerge under the guidelines of the Economic Opportunities Act. These newly formed groups had more flexibility than old line agencies, and were seeking all all the help and support they could muster.

Considerable scrambling for power and political infighting took place during this period. The JCC retained its position of political neutrality and its image of professional service to the community. We did not seek influence or competition. When we wrote a proposal for continuation of the JCC under CAP funding, we readily obtained letters of concurrence from the four Community Committees having jurisdiction in the areas where our centers were located.

Fifteen per cent of our caseload came to us on referrals from non-school agencies. Most of these referrals were through the Youth Board. The Youth Board's street workers had virtually eliminated the fighting gangs in New York.

The focus of their work began to include the problems of employment and skill training, and they began to seek out agencies such as ours for help.

As a group, the Youth Board referrals were the toughest cases we had to work with. Most of them would not come to our centers without their street worker, and even then they displayed considerable alienation and suspicion. That we were reasonably successful with these cases is attested to by the fact that a year has gone by and the Youth Board workers continue to bring in their clients for service.

A result of the working relationship established with the Youth Board was additional opportunities for our clients to be accepted in special programs administered by the Youth Board. We were notified by Youth Board workers whenever a special program was planned, and the mechanics of referral were worked out to assure maximum opportunity for our clients.

Similar arrangements were worked out with the Community Progress Centers in our four areas. Since they were newly formed agencies, the CPC's requested technical assistance from the JCC in setting up programs and in supplying information on the manpower situation in New York. In return, we were able to secure for our clients the special services available at the CPC's. For instance, the CPC's were given Neighborhood Youth Corps slots and were authorized to hire and train sub-professionals from the community. Since we did not have these resources, we traded our expertise and our placement capacity for special consideration for our clients referred to the CPC's.

Of course, these privileges were not abused. All of the services authorized for disadvantaged youths had clear guidelines for eligibility. What we sought was quick service through a minimizing of screening procedures, and a system of feed-back communication.

In the Spring of 1966, JCC staff members volunteered assistance to the community groups who were preparing proposals for the summer programs. In consultations and in actual preparation of proposal drafts, JCC personnel gave of their free time to help the communities plan viable programs and meet the proposal deadline. In one community, screening of applicants for summer positions was done in the JCC center with the assistance of the Center Administrator.

When the summer programs began, there were innumerable administrative and financial difficulties. The same Center Administrator personally arranged for a loan from a bank to meet the first payroll, which had been delayed by red tape. The summer program in that community was the only one in the City to meet its first payroll on time.

What we demonstrated was that the JCC did not function in an academic ivory tower, that we were directly involved in the efforts of the community to provide services to the poor. The professional staff of the JCC shared its expertise with community groups in exchange for a share of the special services the communities were authorized to provide.

E. Special Programs

There were a number of special programs on a city-wide basis which were of particular value to portions of our population. This determination was made through the job developers, whose function it was to scrutinize training programs and special employment opportunities for our clients. The process is described under Program Development, in the section on Placement. This section gives an indication of the scope of the outside services we developed and utilized for our clients.

E.1 - Operation Comeback

This was a six month training program, with pay, in the field of recreation and rehabilitation. It is currently in its third cycle of twenty-five trainees. In the three cycles, all the trainees have been clients of the JCC.

E.2 - Carpet Training Institute

This was a ten week program to train boys in floor-covering skills. We sent twelve clients to the first cycle of forty-five, and eight of them completed the course. Unfortunately, the program was not able to secure union membership for our clients, and so employment for them has been unsteady, or has been limited to the less desirable jobs in the industry. As a result, our screening has gotten tighter, and fewer clients have been sent to subsequent training cycles.

E.3 - Head Start

Sub-professional positions in the Head Start program were sought after by all agencies because of the nature of the work, the hours, and the wages. We managed to place some of our clients in the Head Start Summer Program of 1965, and their experience was highly rewarding.

When the Head Start program began again in February, 1966, we were promised direct referral rights, and the counselors began to screen their caseloads for applicants.

However, the community agencies raised a howl and demanded exclusive rights to Head Start jobs in their areas. The City authorities acceded to the demands, and we had to scramble around to place our clients. We managed to place sixty-two youths in the program, primarily because of our relationships with the community groups. However, the twenty-five positions promised to our Queens clients were transferred to Staten Island, and those youths were left to swallow another bitter pill of disappointment.

E.4 - Neighborhood Youth Corps

Neighborhood Youth Corps slots were assigned to various agencies at various times, and our job developers had to keep track of the shifting patterns. Almost invariably the agencies ran short of applicants, and were able to refer our clients who needed this kind of experience. The trick was to know who had openings that were unfilled, and then to set up a referral system.

Of course, the restrictions on family income were a handicap to a full utilization of the NYC potential.

We did not keep separate records on the number of NYC placements we made, but there were several hundred at least. Many of these returned for additional placement after their NYC experience.

JOB DEVELOPMENT AND PLACEMENT

A. INTRODUCTION

B. THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PLACEMENT

1. Early Placement as Reality Orientation and Source of

2. Upgrading

C. THE PLACEMENT ROLE IN THE PROGRAM

1. The Placement Role as Separate from Counseling
2. Client Identification with the Job Developer
3. The Relationship of Job Development and Placement

D. TECHNIQUES OF JOB DEVELOPMENT

1. Slots Vs. Jobs

2. The Relationship with the Employer

E. TECHNIQUES OF PLACEMENT

1. Pre-Placement Interview
2. Introduction to the Employer

F. FOLLOW-UP

G. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

H. STATISTICS

JOB DEVELOPMENT AND PLACEMENT

A. INTRODUCTION

Since the special Placement Report was submitted, some changes have taken place in the direction and emphasis of the placement unit. These changes represent an embellishment of the placement function as outlined in that report. This section of the Final Report repeats some of our earlier statements and findings, and gives an account of placement activities previously unreported.

Because job development and placement have been a major part of the program from its inception, we can look back and trace the growth of these related activities. The job developers have been under constant pressure, so that most changes have come about because of the pressure. Like a military structure, the placement unit has hardened and developed under fire. Unfortunately, we have never had an era of peace, during which the analysts and strategists could digest what has happened in the heat of battle and apply it in a scholarly way to the next situation.

To continue the analogy, we can now identify in retrospect the major battles; certain periods and incidents stand out now as turning points. Their circumstances and their effects are described in the body of this section.

B. THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PLACEMENT

B.1. Early Placement as Reality Orientation and Source of Income

The idea of early placement as a substitute for a period of paid training is not based on a philosophical approach which reflects the dignity of labor. The fact is that there are too few training programs that pay enough for a disadvantaged youngster to survive the training period. Also, a common reaction to the suggestion of training is, "I've had enough of school." As a result, we have had hundreds of youths who could not afford to take available training, and hundreds who did not want it.

Substantial numbers of the latter group changed their minds after exposure to the job world, but that kind of attitudinal change took time, and in the meantime, they needed a job.

The need for a job was without a doubt the most common motivating factor which brought the youths to the centers. Since the program had as one of its stated goals meeting the needs of the clients quickly, job development and placement were extremely important activities. In fact, the program could not have existed without the placement unit.

The job developers were subjected to considerable pressure to provide jobs quickly. What these pressures meant, and how the job developers dealt with them, are explained in the section on Techniques of Job Development.

To the youths, the promise of a job right away was what drew them to the centers. The counselors knew they could not hold their clients very long without meeting their needs, so they depended very heavily on the placement unit to move quickly. The possibility that many of the youths would take the job and not return was a calculated risk that the counselors had to take, because without the job, there was no chance that the client would stay around very long.

Since the bulk of the jobs were entry level, early placement was seen as a start to upgrading. The youths who took one job and never returned were considered unsuccessful cases, even though individual cases can be otherwise qualified by the counselors. In a number of cases, the most the program could do was provide a series of jobs and a supportive relationship; changes indicating "success" were not dramatic enough to record statistically. However, the program constantly strove for ways to break this pattern and provide or discover new opportunities with legitimate upgrading potential.

A projection of the data processing study figures indicates that 16% of our population was placed but did not see a counselor more than twice. For any number of reasons, they just did not return after placement. Because of the way placement records were kept, we have no way of knowing which of these placements were in private industry, and which were in training programs or Neighborhood Youth Corps slots. The latter category included supportive services like counseling, so in a sense the youths so placed can not be considered "lost".

It is fair to say, though, that a substantial number of that 16% went into private employment, and if their work record approximates that of the rest of our caseload, we can estimate that roughly one third of them were unemployed again within a month. Why they did not come back remains a problem. Some of them may not have needed additional service, and some of them may yet return, since the program is ongoing. Some of them have undoubtedly gone to other agencies. But our anxiety concerns those youngsters who took a job, probably at the legal minimum wage, and who felt that was all the program had to offer.

A stated goal of the JCC was to use the youth's experience of the early placement as a tool in upgrading. The entry level job was a component in the program, as was counseling or remediation. The responsibility of transmitting that view to the client remained with the counselor, and the related problems are covered in the section on counseling. The problems for the job developers were finding the jobs and placing the youths.

Since the JCC paid no stipends, the job developers were under great pressure to provide that first job for the new clients. The statistics from the Placement Report show that 77% of all youths placed obtained their first placement within four weeks of intake. The following excerpt, from a conference of the job developers which was taped, indicates the confidence of the job developers in finding employment for the youths who are brought to them:

> We will place almost all the youngsters who have come to us for placement if they stay with us a reasonable time. Whether they are 18,19,21....we do place them. Practically all of them. It's a rare exception for any kid who stays with us any length of time not to be placed. We can't guarantee the first time we send him out that he is going to be placed, not even the second time, but within two, three, four, or five times referred, he will be placed on a job. The ones that haven't been placed are the ones who come in once, who may be sent out on a job, and who never come back.

It should be understood that when a job developer talks about a youth's "coming in," he is referring to his office, not the center. Many of the youths who were not placed were never seen by the job developer. The introduction depended on the counselor's perception of the youth's need and readiness for employment, and also on the youth's willingness to return, since we had a general policy to avoid first night referrals to the job developer. Approximately 32% of our clients who went through the intake procedure never got to the job developers.

All of these, however, received some service from a counselor, and so are included as part of our population, even though we can not quantify the service they received.

The point to be made in this section, since it comes under the heading of placement, is that the population seen by the job developers was about 68% of the total program population. This does not mean that this population was a cream group; those youths who wanted help in getting into college, for instance, would not have seen a job developer unless they needed a job in the meantime. On the other hand, the most alienated youngsters often would not stick with the program long enough to move into the placement phase. The 32% that the job developers never worked with probably came from the highest and lowest ends of the scale, that is, the able youths who needed only guidance and the most disabled, with whom the counselors could not establish a relationship. Of the youths referred to the job developers, approximately 76%* were placed at least once.

B.2. Upgrading

Every time the subject of upgrading was raised in staff conferences, an argument ensued over the definition. The counselors often felt that the job developers were not providing enough opportunities for upgrading, and the job developers held that the counselors considered only dramatic breakthroughs in job opportunities as upgrading. That no one definition emerged from the dialogue shows clearly in the following excerpts from a taped session of job developers. The session was held at the end of the contract period for possible use in this report; what may be most significant is that many of the problems remain open-ended, even at this late date. The job developers present had a wealth of experience in their field, in most cases predating this program. They had placed young people in all kinds of jobs, in all kinds of industries, and at all levels available to the youths we served. They were speaking from a knowledge of the target population and the employment scene in New York City.

---

*based on a placement figure of 52% of the total population, and 68% referred to the placement unit.

The question, posed by the Project Director, who was chairing the meeting, asked what portion of the jobs had a potential for upgrading.

Job Developer A: This is not a valid question. We have to examine the upgrading process, if there is one. Our philosophy is quick initial placement then follow-up, which is the key to any kind of upgrading you want to discuss. Do the counselors expect the job developer to do the follow-up and the upgrading?
The counselor has got to do the follow-up processing, to prepare the kid in some way for upgrading. The kid is not necessarily going to change from having a job. There has got to be some added ingredient. This has got to be supplied by the counselor.

Job Developer B: When we talk about immediate placement, urgent placement, we're saying that we're trying to get the kid a job as quickly as possible. So on that first placement very little upgrading takes place, even though we are utilizing what the kid has to offer ....We're not just throwing everybody into messenger or dish washing jobs. We're using whatever the kid has when he comes to us at that particular time.

Job Developer C: We've been kicking upgrading around for a very long time. When a youngster takes a job as a stock clerk and he holds that job for three months, he gets a five dollar raise. Would you consider this upgrading?

Job Developer B: What is the definition of upgrading? Do we mean more money? Do we mean change from a service job to a clerical job? What do we mean?

Chair: The definition would have to indicate movement along a variety of lines. An increase in money would be one. Another part of upgrading has to do with movement along in such a way as to be able to predict with some degree of certainty what the next five years might lead to in enhancing employability - being able to support a family, moving into the labor market and making a living wage.

Job Dev C: What about the kid who takes a job, holds on for four months, gets a raise, and learns enough about the details of the job so that he can go on a horizontal basis until he can get another raise. He has to go horizontally for a while before he starts to go vertically - do stockwork before he might move into receiving. As long as he is able to hold a job and absorb the skill that is being taught to him on the job, I would consider this upgrading.

Job Dev D: I have found that a kid who gets an initial job and stays with the counselor for an extended period of time is bound to be upgraded because of his involvement in the center. It's the youngster who comes in for two or three visits who isn't upgraded by us. By and large, the youngsters who have been with us for extended periods will move from job to job and move up. You can't do this when counselors don't follow-up on kids. When there is no follow-up, the kid will not come back and you can't move them.

Job Dev A: Something disturbs me. I am not even sure that the kids who hold jobs for four months really need our services anyway and won't upgrade themselves.

Job Dev D: The counselor has to work with the youngster for the youngster to want to add something to his total employability and move along.

Chair: What is your feeling, ______?

Job Dev B: I don't know...both(A) and (D) have said things that hold true to a certain extent. I wouldn't knock (A)'s position of saying that a kid who works four months probably

wouldn't have needed our help. But I also feel that a certain proportion benefited from our help who couldn't have done it on their own.
As far as upgrading, I think the point is that somewhere along the line they have to acquire certain skills after that initial placement. We place the kid on a job, that being his immediate need. Somewhere after that, whether it be on the job, in our shops, or in some training program, he has to acquire skills to go up, to make any significant progress.
Sure, he may start at fifty five, and after a year make sixty five a week...we have a great number of cases like that. By staying on the job long enough the person works his way up the salary scale. But he will still be a laundry worker, which he started out as. He'll be making more money, but unless he acquires some additional skills along the way, he will still be the same laundry worker.

Job Dev C: I would like to cite a specific case, about a girl who was placed at____just about a year and a half ago. The girl was a high level CRMD (retardate). She worked steadily, stayed on the job six months, and then she started to get bored. There was a little dissatisfaction, and she kept coming back and talking with her counselor. The counselor explained,...you're working for six months, you are making progress, so just be patient. She came in frequently for about a month. Then, at the end of a month's time, she got a raise and she started working as an inspector. She is still there. She has gotten three raises, and she is doing a fine job. This is an instance of upgrading through the job and through the counselor.

This discussion touches on the major elements in upgrading for our target population, from the job developers' point of view. The process requires at least one or a combination of the following:

a.) counselor support

b.) acquired skills

c.) good work record

d.) jobs with horizontal & vertical mobility:

It was the job developers' exclusive responsibility to provide the last element, and, understandably, they felt most confident when the first three elements were present. They recognized the limitations of dead-end jobs that provided periodic raises to the persistent employee, especially when those jobs started from the totally unrealistic minimum wage. The best that could be said about the minimum wage was that it was higher than the Neighborhood Youth Corps stipend, and for many of our clients the extra twelve dollars was essential.

From the youth's point of view, upgrading had some other dimensions, either additional or different. A youth with some ability and motivation could find his own way up in the employment scale, with no help from the JCC beyond the initial placement. This was not common, nor is it fair to assume that anyone can do it; the barriers and pitfalls remain formidable, especially for non-white youths. But occasionally a counselor making follow-up calls to clients he had not seen in several months would hear modest Horatio Alger stories, indicating at least that some of the youngsters were making upward moves on their own. Of course, the counselor could say that he provided the opening, and perhaps both of them would be justified. Nevertheless, this kind of success seldom occurred with hard core youths.

Some of the youths returned to full-time school, or entered trade extension courses, or could afford to attend full-time training programs paying modest stipends. These were also upgrading movements which did not challenge the job developers directly. The cases that caused the most friction between job developers and counselors were usually variations on the following:

> Female client, 19 years old, 9th Grade dropout, reads at 5th Grade level. Lives alone with her two young children. Scattered experience in factory work, no clerical skills. Needs $85 dollars a week to live. Aspirations toward secretarial work. Highly motivated.

This is not an unusual case. Anyone connected with a youth program recognizes this girl and knows the frustrations that arise in trying to provide help. Her children are too young for Day Care Centers, and Welfare will not help her unless she stays home with them. She needs remedial help, work experience, and skill training. To the counselor, the obvious solution is a clerical trainee position that pays $85 a week. That is what a job developer is for.

The girl in this case was not condemned to life on the assembly line, but getting her out of the factory and started on a more satisfying occupation, without forcing her to give up her children, demanded all of the creativity and determination the job developer could muster, as well as the support and encouragement of the counselor.

The difficulties in this case, and hundreds of others like it, are not peculiar to this program, nor do we maintain that we were always successful. We add our voice to the swelling chorus that protests the poverty of the war on poverty, and we cite cases like the one above as illustrations. However, the JCC did come to grips with the problems, and that struggle undoubtedly is more to the moment of a Final Report than a litany of the shortcomings of the youth manpower scene.

-

C. THE PLACEMENT ROLE IN THE PROGRAM

C.1. The Placement Role as Separate from Counseling

Since the centers were open only in the evening, the JCC could have used its counselors during the day to develop jobs. In the evening, they could have made referrals to the jobs from their own caseloads. They knew their clients well, their strengths, their weaknesses, their aspirations, their needs. Why introduce another person into the process?

But the question has to be reversed to understand all of its ramifications; certainly a counselor could develop jobs and place his clients, but could he still be a counselor? Would it not affect his relationship with his clients to look at them from the pragmatic view of an employer, if in fact he could remove himself from the subjective involvement of counseling?

The JCC took the position that the objectivity required for successful job development and placement was separate from and perhaps alien to the empathy required of a good counselor. The amount of friction that is natural to the counselor-job developer dialogue has given us some indication of the natural antipathy of the two functions. In fact, an absence of the friction is a cue that one of the parties is not doing his job.

The separate roles also provided for the clients fuller service than if they were combined, or if one were omitted. The counselors were free to do the most effective counseling they could, and the job developers were similarly free to develop jobs and place youngsters. Exigencies were responded to by occasional overlapping of lines, since priority was given to service rather than a maintenance of organizational charts, but the emphasis remained on separation of the two functions.

In the preceding section on upgrading, the quotes from the job developers included their views of the separate responsibilities. The excerpts that follow are from a meeting of counselors, during which the issue of separate functions was raised.

Counselor A: I'll tell you why it's better. I think it is better in terms of the philosophy of the counseling relationship. Once you become the placement man, everything you think of, whether you are doing it consciously or not, will be to fit this kid to the right job, and the right job to the right kid. You lose sight of the kid as an individual. I would not want to do this. I like the idea that he has to go out and meet a new individual whose relationship with him is very impersonal, who wants to know what he has to offer, who isn't going to be particularly disturbed if the kid has a bad experience during the day. His function is a very cold efficient one. He gets the person a job and that's it, whereas I am concerned about every facet of this kid.

Counselor B: I think there are two reasons here why we should have a job developer. Speaking for myself, I think counselors tend to become protective of their kids, and probably it's generally true that our estimate of the kid will tend to be higher than somebody who doesn't know him. Perhaps we're right, but we generally overestimate...I think it's good to have an intermediate person to say to me, hey, you're going overboard. This kid can't handle such and such. I've found that ninety-nine per cent of the time my job developer is right.

What was essential for this division of service to be effective was mutual confidence and respect. If a counselor began to send the job developer clients who were not ready for employment, the job developer reacted negatively. If a job developer began to show a lessening of sensitivity or could not produce jobs fast enough, the counselor reacted negatively. The following exchange, between counselors from different centers, shows a contrast in situations.

Counselor C: (In response to a suggestion that his view of counseling may reflect how he feels he is being served by the other components.) This is true, I am glad that you brought it up, because we don't function in a vacuum. We are not there by ourselves. This is an area that I find has made me uncomfortable in my relationship with my client - what happens when he leaves me and goes to the placement people.

Counselor D: I might feel the same way if my job developer were a different person. If I thought that the kid was not getting full service, or the kind of interest he needed, then I say that I'd like to handle it. I don't know...but, I know that what I am getting I am satisfied with...At this point I feel comfortable with the service, so I don't want to change it....As long as you have jobs, then you can do the counseling.

C.2. Client Identification with the Job Developer

One of the effects of the division of services was a tendency toward a shift of responsibility to the job developers. It appeared that some counselors gave over their clients to the job developers, as though they believed their responsibility ended once the youth began the process of placement. Some of the youths, sensing that the job developer could meet their immediate needs, moved away from their counselors and established relationships with the job developer. One of the causes was the availability of the job developers during the day, as against the counselors' part-time availability in the evening only.

These situations were not easy to detect. Since the counselors were always busy, and the job developers were busier (the ratio was one job developer to each center, with four to six counselors), this kind of subtle transformation of responsibility tended to be seen only in retrospect. Occasionally a youth would say something about his counselor and mention the job developer's name, and it would become embarrassingly evident that the counselor had made no impact on that client. Also, periodic examinations of the records showed some cases wherein the youth had been placed two or three times but had seen his counselor only once or twice.

For a counselor oriented program, this kind of activity had to be questioned. In fact, the program philosophy had to be questioned. In fact, the program philosophy had to be examined to see if it were not being disproved in practise. The question remained throughout the program's duration whether or not the idea of separate functions of counseling and placement was anything more than an academic exercise.

What always prevented a dismissal of the philosophy was the evidence provided by the work of the "strong" counselors. Each center had at least one counselor who was so regarded, even though the definition was never refined. Holding power, sensitivity, involvement, ability to relate, were all part of the definition, but the acid test was whether or not all of a "strong" counselor's clients could properly identify him when asked by a third party who their counselor was.

As simplistic as this sounds, it proved to be a fairly accurate rule of thumb, and it also demonstrated that a counselor could establish a relationship, and his identity as a positive factor, with disadvantaged youths who were seeking employment. This relationship, removed from the process of job referrals, was the only means for the youth to begin to explore many of his personal problems that had a bearing on his employability. For instance, an earring on a boy affected his chances of passing an employment screening. To the job developer, the earring was a liability because he knew what kind of reaction it would cause. To the counselor, the earring said something about the client which was removed from its impact on a personnel officer. A "strong" counselor could work with the problem, whereas a weak counselor might leave it to the job developer.

C.3. The Relationship of Job Development and Placement

The JCC did not separate job development from placement; the title "job developer" included both functions. A job developer was assigned to each of the four centers, and was given the responsibility of developing jobs and placing all the clients from that center who were seeking employment.

Since we were trying to find for our clients the best possible jobs, even on the initial placement, which was usually at entry-level, we found it necessary to combine the two functions rather than to have a job development team and a placement team. First hand knowledge of the employer and the youth was the best insurance of matching the youth's skills with the available job openings. This system provided personal service to the client, and it encouraged the confidence of the employers.

The job developers were dealing in relationships with people rather than with slips of paper. Naturally, the advantages increased with time as the relationships developed. A youth who came to the center for his second and third jobs knew the job developer, and so the placement process was individualized. The job developer could draw on the experience of the first placement - his knowledge of how the youth fared on the first job - to make judgments about subsequent referrals.

Similarly, the job developer got to know employers over a period of time, and he could make judgments about them - the kind of help they were looking for, the possibilities of upgrading, their receptiveness to minority group members. Both of these relationships made the job developer's work easier, but more importantly, more effective.

D. Techniques of Job Development

D.1. Slots vs. Jobs

The two major categories of jobs were entry level and above entry level. The entry level jobs were always available, and the job developers kept a backlog of these openings to accommodate unskilled youths who needed immediate placement. Since these jobs needed only a minimum of screening, they were, in a sense, guaranteed slots. Messenger jobs and factory jobs were the most common entry level jobs, and it was a rare night when a job developer did not have six of these jobs in his pocket. His work as a job developer required nothing more than a few phone calls to find out where the openings were that day. As soon as he tried to place someone above entry level, however, the picture changed.

It was not that no openings existed above entry level, nor that they were scarce; they were tailored for middle-class youths, and the requirements were based on middle-class values. Even assuming an absence of malice in employers, the educational and skill levels required for "better" jobs discriminated against our population. Add to that an active hostility to police records, emotional disorders, illegitimate children, minority group mannerisms, and a dozen other "disabilities" that offended a large portion of the business community, the problems become obvious.

The efforts of the JCC in this area were directed toward reducing the extremes. For the youths, the program encouraged skill acquisition and the ability to project what approximated a middle-class veneer. The job developers worked with the employers, trying to educate them, placate them, and involve them in a movement to broaden the opportunities for disadvantaged youths. The phone and mail campaigns conducted for job openings stressed the ongoing supportive services that the program provided for its clients. We constantly attempted to reassure employers that we were not picking up youths off the streets and sending them off to job interviews. We stressed our screening process and our sensitivity to individual personnel problems. In short, we offered our services as an extension of an employer's personnel office.

D.2. The Relationship with the Employer

When the job developers placed a youth with a new employer, they offered additional service. They assured him that the youth's counselor would maintain contact and support, and they encouraged the employer to call at any time to discuss the youth's situation on the job. This was not entirely sales promotion, since feedback and supportive services were part of the program's operation, but it did produce an element of risk that the job developer might bend too far to satisfy the employer.

The technique was effective with many employers, and the JCC developed many "exclusives." Acceptance by an employer of the JCC as his sole referral source was most helpful in getting borderline applicants into a job. Upgrading possibilities increased as the employer shared his personnel problems with the job developer, and eligibility standards tended to relax.

With the large companies, it was practically impossible to establish a relationship which could lead to changes in hiring policies. Some of their personnel officers were cooperative and sympathetic, but they did not have the authority to set policy. Except for factory jobs, the large companies used a screening test aa the eligibility determinant and the tests were the biggest single obstacle for our population. The label "Equal Opportunity Employer" often meant only that the test was open to minority group members; it did not mean that eligibility standards were adjusted to accommodate cultural and educational differences. The problem remained, with the large companies, of bringing the youths up to acceptable levels of middle class acculturation. Our greatest impact on employment attitudes was felt by the smaller companies.

An employer who used the JCC as an exclusive referral source was given preferential treatment by the job developers when he needed employees. The job developers were responsive to his needs in order to protect the employment potential he represented. Curiously, these relationships seldom lasted for more than a few months. Sometimes it became apparent that the employer was merely using the program to recruit cheap help. He would not hesitate to fire our clients who were slow or who resisted exploitation because he knew we could replace them quickly. Unfortunately, our reaction to these employers was often painfully slow, perhaps indicating a reluctance of the job developers to give up a familiar and easy source of jobs.

On the other hand, sometimes the pattern was reversed. The job developers sent less and less qualified youths in an effort to expand opportunity. Often an incident on the job seemed to trigger the employer's realization that our screening process was not protecting him from what he considered unemployable youths, and he would close the door to further referrals from us.

When the decision was ours to stop referring youths, it was often characterized by mixed feelings which reflected an ambiguous situation. For instance, one employer insisted on maintaining an equal racial balance in his company, so he requested that each three job applicants include a Negro, a Puerto Rican, and a white youth. Another employer, who had good paying jobs requiring little skill, asked that we send him only attractive girls because, he said, the company manufactured cosmetics and had an image to maintain. It was not always easy to establish when we were contributing to a prejudicial situation and when we were being oversensitive.

When an employer and a job developer had a workable relationship, a positive result in addition to the job openings was the feedback information on JCC clients who were working. The numbers of employed clients were too great to permit effective follow-up field trips, so the job developers had to rely on feedback from the employers. Most employers were responsive and cooperative when they realized that the job developers were concerned about the youths they had placed, and they were quite happy to give the program a chance to work with a youth who was not performing well.

The job developer was the contact with the employer, but the counselor was the contact with the youth. The job developer passed along to the counselor whatever information he had received from the employer, and the counselor contacted the youth. Of course, the employer seldom bothered to feed back positive information, so the counselors usually contacted the youth in an effort to forestall a job loss.

Many problems were personal in nature and needed the skill of the counselor to be fully explored. This system allowed the job developer to be aware of the youth's situation without bein responsible for his problems. If the counselor found out tha the problems stemmed from the job situation, he could consult the job developer and request another placement.

E. TECHNIQUES OF PLACEMENT

E.1. Pre-Placement Interview

When the job developers went to the evening centers, they conducted interviews with those youths whom the counselors presented for employment. Whenever possible, the counselor remained with his client during this first interview. The job developer's perception often tempered the inclination of the counselor to overrate the youth's employability.

For initial placements, the job developers relied heavily on this first interview. If the youth requested a job requiring some skills, the job developer could ask for a reading test and a math test, and where applicable, a typing speed test. Once the youth was referred to a job, the job developer could get from the employer a report on the youth's interview. Referring a youth to a job soon after his entry into the program began a process of accumulation of hard fact about the youth's ability to function in the job world, and permitted both the job developer and the counselor to focus on the youth's strengths and weaknesses.

The first interview was also an interim step for the youth which gave him the experience of a simulated employment interview. For the clients who had no previous work experience, the counselor used the interview as a practical lesson in the techniques of applying for a job. Knowing what an employment interviewer wants to hear is often critical in securing a job, and the interview with the job developer saved many clients from disqualifying themselves through ignorance, fear, or naivete.

The interaction of the job developer and the counselor in the pre-placement phase sought to give the youth a clearer picture of himself and the job world. The counselor was protective and supportive and the job developer was realistic in a non-threatening way. The youth had a chance to explore his feelings about jobs without fearing rejection or betrayal.

E.2. Introduction to the Employer

Applicants for jobs were given cards of introduction by the job developer. The cards served to give the applicant a sense of identity with the program, allaying apprehension of automatic rejection. In most cases, appointments were made to see specific interviewers, and the youths were given the time of the appointment and the name of the person to see.

Preparation of this sort was essential for jobs above entry level, where our clients were competing with more able applicants. The slightest slip in the introductory process was often enough to cause severe pain and regression. Sometimes it took a youth six months to work up the courage to apply for a "good" job, and a setback often had disastrous results. Knowing this from their experience, the job developers took every precaution to insure at least an impartial reception from the employer.

The employers reacted favorably to appointments and introductory cards, at times refusing to interview youths without a card. This kind of response indicated at least that they recognized some value to the job developer's function of screening, and therefore any youth having a JCC card had an edge over a youth coming in off the street. The job developers of course capitalized on every opportunity to give their clients an edge, however slight, over their competitors. Salesmanship was certainly not foreign to the placement component, as was evident in the pride that accompanied the "sale" of a marginally employable youth to an employer.

F. FOLLOW-UP

It was the job developers' responsibility to obtain feedback information from the employer and inform the counselors of their clients' status. Because of the time factor, this activity was haphazard in execution. Usually the job developers made follow-up inquiries when they called an employer about new job openings.

The clients who returned to the centers after placement for additional counseling or other supportive services were never a problem in terms of follow-up, but the clients who did not return were often lost, in the sense that we did know what was happening to them. This fact became painfully evident as a result of our involvement in a special program, called In School Neighborhood Youth Corps in Municipal Government. A report of a follow-up study of this program is included in this Final Report under a separate heading.

The program was set up for 180 out-of-school disadvantaged youngsters, and it provided three hours of school and three hours of work a day. Three factors prevented the job developers from maintaining any control: intensive recruiting, excessive paperwork, and the rapidity with which youths dropped out of the program. In almost every case that was terminated, the job developers could not get feedback until it was too late for the counselors to do anything supportive.

Some of the youngsters benefitted from the program, but our feelings of frustration were caused by the realization that we were merely a referral source. The counselors recruited the youngsters, and the job developers finished the paperwork and arranged the job interview. Very few of the youths kept in touch with their counselors once they entered the program. The mechanics were so cumbersome, and the jobs were so scattered, the job developers could do little to keep the counselors informed. The follow-up study clearly indicated the shortcomings of the situation and allowed us to focus on the need for coordinated follow-up.

We found that the problems of follow-up differed when the clients were in private employment and when they were in training programs. Clients in private employment were more likely to understand the role of the JCC as a supportive program, and so were more likely to respond to follow-up inquiries. In training programs, apparently, there was a greater likelihood that the youths no longer considered themselves part of the JCC. The need for follow-up was much greater, because there was much less client-initiated communication than we had gotten used to receiving.

G. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Differences in follow-up procedures were part of a new set of rules that evolved as we began to use more training programs as substitutes for employment. During the last six months of the contract, the job developers spent a good deal of their time in program development. Their experience contributed to the evolvement of the techniques necessary to utilize training programs effectively for our clients.

Program development has a special meaning within the JCC; it has come to be an important part of the program, and our experience is worth recording as an experimental feature.

We had been accustomed to using the standard MDTA training programs for that portion of our population best able to benefit from them and economically able to exist during the training period. Aside from the economic hardship, the waiting periods and the screening procedures made the available training programs less accessible than they should have been.

In searching for new opportunities and in experimenting with a few newly funded programs, we uncovered some elemental truths. Most new programs had difficulty in recruiting, and most referral sources provided no supportive services during the training period. We found that if we contacted a new program before it had recruited trainees, we could be accepted as a prime referral source. We could telescope the screening procedure and shorten the waiting periods. Because we had access to training programs, we could offer our clients meaningful options to an entry-level job.

We began to develop our skills in recruiting and screening for specific training programs, and in maintaining contact with our clients when they were placed. We provided supportive services such as remediation, high-school equivalency courses, and part-time jobs. What we were demonstrating was that although a program does not have the budget to provide all the services needed for this target population, it can find most of the services it needs if it is willing to use other programs.

Most programs are sensitive about their dropout rate. This sensitivity can work against the best interests of the target population if it causes a reluctance to refer clients to other programs better suited to meet a particular need. We managed to use the services of other programs and still feel we had not lost our clients, mainly because we had evening centers that did not compete with the training programs operating during the day. We could legitimately serve youths who were in training at other facilities during the day, just as we served youths who were working in private employment during the day. They were still "our kids".

Referrals into programs offering special services were made as part of the placement function. The job developers had the responsibility of gathering information on these programs, maintaining liaison with them, and keeping the counselors informed on guidelines and recruiting dates. The programs ranged from college opportunity plans to specific vocational training projects.

The responsibility of the JCC to its clients increased when the clients were referred to special programs rather than private employment. A job, even a dead-end entry level job, guaranteed a financial reward to the youth, allowing him to make a judgment on simple terms. Even if he quit the job after a week, the youth was paid his wages. In a training program, however, the reward was distant and not so easy to evaluate. To give up six months for training with a modest stipend was a major investment for our clients, and they depended on their counselors to evaluate that investment in terms of upgrading and employment possibilities as the payoff.

Recognition of the added responsibility in referrals to training programs was highlighted by our experience with a program called Operation Comeback. This program was set up to train twenty five disadvantaged people as recreational aides to work with retarded children in state and private institutions. Beginning in November, 1965, Comeback offered three months classroom training at Teacher's College, Columbia University, and three months on-the-job training at various hospitals and institutions.

One of the job developers read a newspaper account of Comeback's funding, and he arranged a conference with the director. At the conference, we were assured that a civil service title of Recreational Aide was being established, and that the need for people in this work was virtually unlimited. Since Comeback at that time had not recruited any trainees, the JCC offered to screen and recruit through its evening centers. As a result, all twenty-five trainees were clients of the JCC, selected on the guidelines set up by Comeback. Twenty-one of them finished the six months training.

A week before the training was completed, we were informed that Comeback had been unsuccessful in establishing the title of Recreational Aide as a recognized position, and therefore hospital budgets could not pay anyone in that category. The trainees were told they could take the civil service test for Recreation Leader, which was a higher position than what they had been trained for, and which required a high-school diploma.

The frustration and despair felt by some of the trainees was understandably severe. The JCC called them in to see their counselors, and the job developers began to cope with the problems of finding jobs for them. Six months later, a follow-up report indicates that ten of the twenty-one are employed in recreation work.

This was the first instance where the entire population of a training program came from the JCC caseload. Naturally, we felt a strong responsibility for what happened to the trainees. We also realized that we had to investigate thoroughly any program to which we would refer our clients, and to make sure we were not glamorizing job prospects in our recruitment process.

Some of the trainees from the first Comeback cycle went on to college, and their counselors credit the training course for supplying the motivation. The program was the first opportunity for many of the trainees to express themselves seriously in a peer group, and to be taken seriously.

The program had a positive impact on almost all of the trainees, and the JCC has continued to recruit for additional cycles. However, each applicant is told that there is no guarantee of a job. The officers of Comeback have not given up the struggle to establish the new job title, and the JCC is cooperating with them in this effort.

This experience made the JCC staff very sensitive to the hazards of referring youths into untested programs, or programs which did not guarantee employment at the end of training. In the case of Comeback, the training itself had merit, and the counselors referred to it those clients who indicated a desire and a need for the experience of group leadership and personal relationships. However, not every training program offers the same kind of positive experience which may be used in other fields of work. Consequently, the JCC assigned a job developer to each special program to which we sent clients, to visit the training site and give the counselors an appraisal of the program. This feedback information was in addition to that obtained from the trainees themselves.

PLACEMENT DATA

REFERRALS: 5,986

PLACEMENTS: 3,493

	Total	Male Total	%	Female Total	%
Clerical	568	183	32%	385	68%
Industrial	1,295	785	61%	510	39%
Sales & Merch.	487	315	65%	172	35%
Service	722	508	70%	214	30%
Training	421	256	61%	165	39%
	3,493	2,047 (59%)		1,446 (41%)	

CHART OF MALE AND FEMALE JOBS, BY %:

	% of Total Jobs	% of Male Jobs	% of Female Jobs
Clerical	16%	9%	27%
Industrial	37%	38%	35%
Sales & Merch.	14%	15%	12%
Service	21%	25%	15%
Training	12%	13%	11%

As could be anticipated, 68% of all clerical jobs went to girls; however, these jobs represent only 27% of all female jobs. For both male and female, industrial jobs were most common (38% of all male jobs, 35% of all female jobs).

Male jobs account for 59% of all placements, yet male clients in the program represent only 55% of the caseload. Two factors may be involved here: males may be under more social and economic pressure to work, and they may be more employable.

PROJECT IMPACT

Outline

A. Internal Evaluation

  1. Monitoring of Records
  2. In-Service Training

B. Project Goals

  1. For the Client
  2. For the Project
  3. For the Board of Education
  4. For the Community

Appendix

A. Internal Evaluation

The problems of evaluating the program as it operated were both plentiful and vexing. As an experimental program, we did not have a standard of performance against which we could measure day-to-day operations. The program was off and running before an evaluative mechanism was formed, and we never quite managed to catch up.

The structure of four evening centers, administered from a central office, added to the difficulty. Outside of general guidelines from the proposal, the four centers had few strict rules to follow in the development of their services. Differences in staff and facilities, and in the needs of the clients, in effect ruled out identical thrust or performance from the centers.

The differences were healthy, but from an administrative standpoint, they added to the difficulties of evaluation. The problem remained of culling from the varied experiences of each of the four centers those that could be implemented with positive results in any of the other three. In striving to build in sufficient objectivity to validate an evaluation, we decided to submit the records of the program to an outside firm for a data processing study. Unfortunately, the gathering and arranging of the data took so much time, the results were not available until after the contract period. They are available with this report, as part of the program record, but they did not contribute to the administrative chore of maintaining an ongoing evaluation.

A.1. Monitoring of Records

The systems of record keeping were developed through the stimulus of utility, rather than research needs. Each component of the program kept its own records, reflecting the activity within that component. What was missing was a central file on each client for recording the history of his association with the program - the number of times he saw a counselor, the jobs he got, the other activities to which he was referred.

The Project Historian, whose functions included recording the statistics, joined the program after it was in operation. In trying to fill in the gaps in information, he designed several new forms and redesigned some of the old ones. Some of the new forms had to be ordered through the Board of Education, and in one case process from design to delivery took seven months. In the meantime, substitute systems were thrown together to avoid losing the data before the advent of the new forms. Because four centers were involved, and four separate staffs, the results were varied. Requests for specific information were usually fulfilled through time-consuming perusals of several sources of data.

Added to these problems was the constant influx of new clients. We had no cycles to look at, analyze, or improve upon; we were always in full swing. The operation was not unlike a perpetual carousel, with youngsters climbing aboard and dropping off at various points. From the sidelines, the only fact easily determined was the number of riders at any given moment.

This fact was not insignificant. A drop in attendance or activity acted as a warning flag that something was wrong, allowing the administrative staff to investigate and correct the situation. For instance, the Weekly Activity Reports from the centers listed the counseling sessions of each counselor, and categorized the counselees as "new" or "old". If the ratio of "old" to "new" clients began to decrease, the probability was that the counselor was losing clients after the initial interview. Since holding power was essential to the program, the Director acted on these warnings to determine the cause and, if necessary, take corrective action.

The gathering of qualitative data for Progress Reports, special monographs, and answers to specific inquiries contributed far more to evaluations of the program than did the day-to-day record keeping systems, which were limited to relatively gross indications of the program's overall activity. The special demands for statistics had the effect of focusing attention on particular issues which were normally obscured by the preoccupation of the staff with coping with the pressures for service.

The counselors, of course, answered specific questions about their clients, sometimes with amazing recall. Most of them could talk at length about every youngster they had seen, even when their familiarity was limited to one session six months prior. However, the case study approach leads to a deluge of background material and individual circumstances. Every client is in a separate category, and it becomes a huge task to identify and isolate significant data.

It was essential for the counselors to see their clients as distinct individuals, as of course they did; however, our ongoing evaluation, and the summation of our experiences as a program, required an outline in bolder lines than case studies could provide.

Between the extremes of gross activity records and individual case histories was a patchy area of forms, figures, and flow charts which yielded significant data only under laborious scrutiny, and often too late to have an impact on a current activity. Hindsight and follow-up studies have little value to a program unless similar situations arise and the lessons can be applied. Now that our experimental period is over, we are in a much stronger position to implement what we have learned about forms, record keeping, and program evaluation. The last section of this report, Summary and Recommendations, contains information in this area which may be of interest to programs with similar problems.

A.2. In-Service Training

Staff training sessions were held approximately every three months. Their purposes were to uncover problems and uncertainties, and to stimulate discussions on all the phases of the program. Some of the statistical material gathered for reporting purposes helped to identify topics that needed clarification and contributed to the focus of the training sessions.

The sessions usually followed a work-shop format, with a final convocation for summarizing. Since the program was experimental, the work-shops contributed to the development of ideas, techniques, and directions, rather than the elucidation of set policies.

Each training session re-emphasized the philosophical and operational framework within which the individual components functioned. Staff members then had an opportunity to see their jobs as part of a coordinated operation, rather than an individual struggle with the problems of poverty. They were then able to relate their work to that of their colleagues and to the general scheme of the anti-poverty effort within the City.

One of the major demonstration features of the program was that school personnel could staff a manpower program. The training sessions started from that premise. There were meetings of trained professionals who were applying their expertise to a new situation. The training sessions were free to explore the interaction and coordination of the various disciplines within the framework provided by the proposal. The tone of each session was set by the combination of professional ability and enthusiasm.

The training sessions were an active form of self-evaluation. They were marked by honesty and self-scrutiny. The limitations of the program were admitted, accompanied by the normal frustrations that identification with a disadvantaged group brings. The prospects for our clients, in terms of employment and educational opportunities, were far less promising than we could be contented with. The deficiencies of the school system were identified and recognized. The staff demonstrated a balanced and realistic understanding of the difficulties they faced in achieving the goals of the program; at the same time, they avoided a sense of fatalism or despair.

In addition to full staff sessions, each of the centers had occasional meetings to resolve issues affecting its operation. At these meetings, such topics as improving communication and increasing holding power were discussed.

Specific situations were also discussed. The job developers used these meetings to impart specific information concerning new opportunities for the clients that they had discovered.

For instance, the job developers would talk about new training programs and agencies offering special services to our population. They would discuss guidelines and referral procedures, and give an appraisal based on their experience.

The value of these meetings increased with time as the program tried to refine its operation and expand its services. When the centers were open, the staff had little time for discussion. We would recommend that time be reserved for bi-weekly meetings in any future operation.

B. Project Goals

B.1. This section is not offered as a substitute for a follow-up study in which the clients themselves could record their feelings about their experience with the program. Our aim here is to review the past eighteen months in terms of the services that were actually rendered to the population we set out to serve.

Because participation in the program was voluntary and unpaid, the number of cases which stayed with us for an extended period was lower than we had hoped it would be. This is especially disappointing because, in retrospect, we can see the amount of growth that took place with those youngsters who did stay with us. Our experience has confirmed our opinion that the program could provide significant help to a disadvantaged populatioh, if that population would invest the necessary time and effort.

The benefits that accrued to "regular" clients had a cumulative effect which was greater than the sum of the component parts that made up the service. The extras were demonstrated in higher aspirations and changes in attitude that could be seen only over a long period of time. We had enough cases like this in each center to know that the program was sound and the staff was effective.

The bulk of the services that were provided came through the counseling and placement components, and they were provided in a shorter span of time than we had anticipated. The placement unit developed 3,500 jobs, Of the initial placements, seventy-five per cent were made within a month of intake. Most of the youngsters who came to the centers looking for jobs were successful. That they recognized the value of the program was indicated by the number of cases which came to us on the recommendation of a friend (37% of total caseload).

The counselors dealt with every problem that was brought to them. Not every problem was solved, but the point to be made here is that the needs of the clients, as the clients saw them, were paramount. The range of problems seemed limitless; if one were to categorize every conceivable problem facing disadvantaged youths, the counselors could match the list, point by point, with at least one anecdote.

So much of the service that was provided by the counselors was not documented. We know the number of counseling sessions and shop sessions that occurred, and the number of jobs that were developed. In the long run, the program will have to stand on these figures; but in terms of service to our clients, the picture is much broader than the figures indicate. To do justice to the program, this report should include several thousand pages of anecdotal material. The writer of this report was a witness to, and often a participant in, hundreds of incidents of service which was above and beyond the scope of recording systems and statistical tabulations.

Counselors arranged for medical and dental services for their clients, often through personal or family contacts. They interceded for their clients with parole officers, landlords, Welfare officials, trade unions, and angry parents. They found apartments and provided clothing. They counseled unwed mothers, drug addicts, and homosexuals. They worked with legal problems, and credit problems, and domestic problems. When a youth asked for help, the counselors responded, regardless of the category of the problem. The maturation process and the enhancement of employability, which was the ultimate aim of the program, included elements which were emotional, physical, and economic; the counselors worked with all three.

B.2. For the Project

The JCC set out to test whether an urban school system had the resources and the personnel to run a manpower program for a population which was out of school and disadvantaged. The unanimous opinion of the staff is that the test was a resounding success. The ease with which the staff adapted itself to the demands of the program was an indication of the talented, flexible, and dedicated people that can be found in a large school system.

Of course, the staff was carefully selected in accordance with the goals of the program. Professional competence was no great problem in recruiting, since we were drawing from a professional pool. The criteria for selection included the less tangible but essential qualities of warmth, commitment, and ability to relate to disadvantaged youths.

These qualities were considered essential because the staff had to function in a much less formal setting than a school situation. Since there was no institutional momentum, the program needed self-generated energy and personal involvement. Both the demands and the rewards were strong.

If the program were to double or treble in size, it is less certain that the same standards of staff excellence could be maintained easily. The point remains, however, that a large school system does contain its representative share of people who are highly qualified to run a non-school anti-poverty program, and who can channel their experience and training into an area generally reserved for community agency personnel.

The question of adequate facilities was less easily resolved. The centers were located in schools; to some of our target population, therefore, the centers were tainted by the school system. Some ofour referral sources indicated that the fear of being coerced or cajoled back to school by the JCC caused apprehension among some youths, especially those who had had painful school experiences.

From the beginning, we were aware of the possibility of this apprehension. We constantly strove to project an image which was distinct from the school system. Recruiting letters and posters stressed our placement capacity, and all communications, both written and oral, with outside groups and agencies were aimed at offsetting an automatic identification with the schools.

The distinction was manifested in the atmosphere of the centers themselves. The thrust was toward informality and warmth, and the effort was a conscious one. Primarily, the burden fell to the secretaries to project the desired degree of welcome to the youths coming in for service; happily, we were fortunate to have very charming ladies serve in that capacity.

Compensating for the psychological overtones of a school setting was not the only problem concerning facilities. We wanted to demonstrate that the shops of the vocational high schools could be used for work try-out and short term training. We found that the schools with a variety of commercial shops offered the best facilities for our purposes. The industrial shops that we tried did not provide enough holding power or job potential to warrant their continuation, especially on a part-time basis.

The schools had ample classroom space for basic education and High School Equivalency classes, and the equipment in the commercial shops was generally adequate for training. Each center adapted itself to its physical plant, and used what was at its disposal to run the program. Each school had its limitations, but none of them were severe enough to prevent the centers from functioning in accordance with the proposal outlines.

The placement component, working under extreme pressure, demonstrated its ability to implement the concept of quick placement as one answer to the economic needs of the clients. Most of the initial placements were entry-level jobs, but almost every youth who stayed with the program to avail himself of the other components was kept employed, and eventually wound up with a better job than he started with.

The teachers in the try-out shops depended on individual instruction to help their trainees. They felt that new methods and structures were less important than the encouragement that came from individual work. The teachers in the remedial class and the High School Equivalency classes, however, had to adapt standard materials and develop new materials to meet the needs of their trainees. They were working with young adults, most of whom were earning their own living and coping with the problems of the adult world. When these clients were working in a basic education class, they carried the onus of past failures with them. In the shops, they were learning new skills, and so did not have to be apologetic about their ignorance.

The program experienced an increasing involvement in community affairs. Its role in the community was that of a servce agency, rahter than an official spokesman for the Board of Education. As a service agency, the JCC met no resistance from community groups, even when those groups had an active hostility to the Board of Education. The JCC was sufficiently apolitical to avoid taking part in factional disputes or being identified as a partisan.

B.3. For the Board of Education

Because of the nature of the program, the JCC held a unique position within the structure of the Board. For payroll and personnel purposes, the program had the status of a school. Operationally, its status was less clearly defined. The ambiguity that existed permitted us to move freely within the general guidelines established by the Board.

The established policy of the Board included an obligation to out of school youths. Under that umbrella existed several operational agencies established by the Board, including the

JCC. We had legitimacy within the system, and at the same time we enjoyed relative freedom in our work in the community.

As an acknowledgement of theprogram's function, the Board made several supportive moves. It contributed the use of the facilities of the schools, including the vocational shops. The facilities represented a huge capital investment. The Board also supplied administrative services for purchasing, auditing, and payroll preparation.

A significant action of the Board was the establishment of Withdrawal Forms. The schools were mandated to conduct Exit Interviews with school leavers and fill out Withdrawal Forms. The completed forms were sent to the JCC central file. The purpose of the forms was to allow the JCC, and other special Board agencies, to identify the out of school population and to offer service to it. Twenty per cent of our caseload were recruited through letters initiated by the Withdrawal Forms, and an additional sixteen per cent were referred to us by school agencies or personnel.

It is difficult to assess the full impact the program has had, or will have, on the school system. The sixty or seventy professionals who worked for the JCC part-time are employed in the schools during the day, and carry with them into that environment the experience of the program. Judging from their comments, the experience has been significant in their professional development and has given them new perspectives on their roles in the school system. It is too soon to evaluate what effect these people will have on school policy as they continue in the system and move up the administrative ladder.

The number of staff people who are moving into supervisory positions increases each year. Two are now working in the Board's MDT unit as supervisors, one in counseling, and one in charge of a Manpower program for adolescent prisoners at Riker's Island Penitentiary. One staff member is now in the office of the Superintendent in charge of coordinating all Federally funded programs.

Program impact can also be inferred from the increased number of speaking engagements for staff members at professional functions. Many school guidance supervisors have used JCC personnel at their professional meetings. The Bureau of Attendance has also had speakers describe the program and its philosophy to its staff. Teacher conferences and in-service courses run by the Board have also called upon the JCC to provide speakers.

B.4. For the Community

In the four communities where we had centers, our major impact was felt by the CAA's that were formed during this period. In varying degrees, each of the communities realized the value of a professional staff. Of course, the communities wanted to run their own programs, and we naturally encouraged them. CAA staff members came to our centers to observe the program and elicit technical advice. They talked to counselors, teachers, and job developers.

Their biggest problem was setting up remedial classes. Most CAA's in our areas continued to send clients to us for these services. In one area, the CAA set up a reading program and staffed it with JCC personnel on a part-time basis. In another area, a CAA administrator tried to discourage his counselors from relying on the JCC for professional service for their clients, but the counselors rebelled, and the administrator yielded to their demands.

As it stands now, it is likely that a working relationship will continue between the JCC and the CAA's, since we have professional services that they can not easily duplicate. Also our connections with the school system are a valuable asset to any CAA which has clients who want to return to school. Rather than compete with each other, the JCC and the CAA's have worked out mutual assistance pacts which add up to better service to the community.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Program Structure and Administration

1. School Personnel and School Facilities
2. Institutionalization
3. Community Status

B. Recruitment and Intake

1. Recruitment Sources
2. Control of Numbers
3. Intake Procedures

C. Basic Education and Training Components

1. Shops
2. Classes

D. Job Development and Placement

1. Early Placement
2. Program Development

. . . .

A. Program Structure and Administration

The JCC has demonstrated that a school system can provide professional people who are qualified to run a program for out of school and disadvantaged youths. That the program not only survived but flourished depended to a large extent on the excellence of its staff. Another essential factor was the flexibility of the program's design and operation, which allowed the staff to grow to maturity as an operational entity.

The life expectancy of a small experimental program within any large bureaucracy like a Board of Education is often slight. The JCC was shielded by two insulating factors: a funding source separate from the Board, and the protective and supportive interest of a Board Superintendent. Both factors gave the program the time it needed to grow and develop.

A.1 - School Personnel and School Facilities

Often unjustly, the Board of Education has received its share of criticism. Unfortunately, the criticism is not very selective; the unresolved difficulties faced by the system too often are attributed to anyone connected with it. JCC staff members became inured to the arched eyebrows and the pointed comments that followed their introduction as Board of Education employees to some segments of the community. The fact remained that their work in the program withstood the scrutiny of some of the Board's most hostile critics.

Undoubtedly, any large school system could staff a program with qualified people. The need for counselors and remediation experts in anti-poverty programs is so great that no recruitment source should be overlooked. We are not suggesting that a school system can solve the problems of poverty, but we are suggesting that the professionals in a school system should not be precluded from a program because of anti-Board sentiment on the part of some CAP people.

Similarly, no community should be deprived of the fullest use of the facilities of its school system. The physical plants and the vocational equipment represent an investment of the community, and it is wasteful if they are available only six hours a day while school is in session.

The JCC tested the use of school rooms and shops in a non-school program, and the results were gratifying. the limited value of the shop program was due more to the part-time hours of the program than the equipment that was used.

More than four thousand disadvantaged youths came to the centers for help, despite their location in school buildings. We suspect some youths could not overcome their aversion to schools and ignored our recruitment appeals, but we dispute any general claim that our target population will not return to a school setting for service.

The operation of the centers in the evening served a number of purposes. The first was that it allowed the clients to work during the day and continue their association with the program in the evening. From a practical standpoint, the schools and the staff were not available during the day. A day operation would have meant the exclusion of school personnel, since classroom service of course has priority in the system.

The four evening centers did, however, need supportive services which could only be supplied during the day. The administrative office had to take care of payrolls and supplies, and all the other administrative matters that are part of running a program. In addition, the job development unit worked during the day from the administrative office. with a relatively small full-time staff - seven or eight people - we found that we could meet the needs of the four evening centers.

The greater demands on time caused by increased involvement in the community eventually led us to the conclusion that additional help was needed during the day. As training programs became available and as new community agencies were formed, a new dimension was added to the straightforward job development we had depended on in the past.

Toward the end of the program, with the prospect of new funding and an increase in size, the decision was made that the administrators of the evening centers should work full-time in the program. The experimental stage was coming to an end, and we began to build a more permanent structure.

A.2 - Institutionalization

The evolution of a program from an experimental and flexible venture to an institution with its own bureaucratic disciplines has obvious pitfalls. The question remains of whether performance can be duplicated when a program gives up the exciting and informal atmosphere of its formative days. Manpower programs seem especially vulnerable to the calcifying process; today's innovation is tomorrow's "old line agency."

The JCC has reached the point of maturity; it is beginning to take on some of the characteristics of a bureaucracy. The effect of the process has been speculated by the staff with understandable anxiety. Vigilance and resistance by the administration must be maintained during the institutionalizing process if the program is to preserve its vitality.

Hopefully, the JCC will come to have a stronger voice in the Board concerning youths who are out of school. The process of leaving school and the process of getting back in need refining and perhaps revision. The experience of the JCC with this population makes it a resource in the field and may, in the future, lead to a much greater impact on the school system than it has so far been able to make.

A.3 - Community Status

As the program grew, its impact on the community also grew. As technical resources to the community, the four centers have earned respect and recognition. Where there was, for some, apprehension because of our affiliation with the Board, there there was also acknowledgment of the quality of the services we have been providing. Community agencies have never hesitated to send their most difficult cases to us for service.

For other communities, we would urge utilization of the professional skills available in their school systems. Program administration and policy decisions depend on the political climate of the individual community action scenes, but each community is faced with the shortage of trained people to work in anti-poverty programs. We have demonstrated that school personnel, if carefully selected, can perform well in this area. What we can not say with any assurance is whether other communities can utilize their school personnel without the kind of support available by the NYC Board of Education.

The needs of the community, especially of the population being served, must determine the operation of a program. The JCC responded to community needs and served the community well; whether other communities and other school systems can duplicate this arrangement depends on how vigorously community needs are pursued, plus a generous dash of good fortune.

B. Recruitment and Intake

B.1 - Recruitment Sources

The school system is the logical source for information on school leavers.

The JCC was fortunate to have the cooperation of the Board in this regard. The Withdrawal Forms mandated by the Board for school leavers allowed us to reach hundreds of youths who otherwise would have probably joined the ranks of the invisible poor in the ghettos.

We discovered that we were not the only program to appreciate the value of the schools for recruitment. Many other youth programs simply went to schools with high dropout rates and asked for lists of discharged students. In New York, there are not enough programs to service the entire out of school population, so no responsible authority has bothered to regularize recruitment procedures. However, this would seem to be a logical step for the future. At this time we would simply point out the major contribution the schools can make in this area.

We did not depend exclusively on the schools for recruitment. Youths came to us from a hundred different sources, including community agencies, parole officers, and street workers. As our reputation grew, the referral sources increased. For new programs, the problem is to find enough clients to get started. After that, the momentum is maintained by program performance and public relations. The grapevine in New York among out of school youths is well informed and has a decisive effect on a program"s recruitment.

B.2 - Control of Numbers

Since the program had no cycles, recruitment was constant. Our aim was to control the rate of incoming clients so that we could absorb them without delay.

Not once was a youth told that he could not receive service the first night he appeared at a center.

The control of new cases was maintained by varying the intensity of recruitment procedures. Each center did its own recruitment, according to its needs. When the center was operating at capacity, recruitment activities stopped. Our center in Brooklyn stopped all recruitment drives six months prior to the end of the contract because it was drawing so many youths referred by other clients. New clients continued to come in sufficient numbers to keep the center running at maximum capacity.

B.3 - Intake Procedures

The intake procedures at the evening centers were simple and to the point, Our guidelines for eligibility were three: out of school; unemployed, or underemployed; and disadvantaged. A few simple questions from the secretary indicated a youth's eligibility, and the remainder of the process merely included some questions on background for the Intake Sheet.

The whole procedure was geared to move the youth as quickly as possible into an interview with a counselor. The program was based on the premise that our counselors could establish a relationship with our clients, and the relationship would be the vehicle through which all other services flowed and the setting wherein the client could evaluate his needs and his options. The counselor was the client's agent for as long as the client felt he needed him. There was no programmatic series of steps which the client was forced to take to satisfy a master plan.

Each client worked with his counselor and decided what options he wanted. Entry into the other components of the program depended on the youth's willingness and motivation, not on a mechanical appraisal of his strengths and weaknesses.

This approach reflected the program's recognition of the primacy of the client's perception of his needs. This was a function of the counseling component, not of the intake process, and so the intake process was kept to a minimum.

Toward the end of the program, revisions were made in the record keeping system to compensate for gaps in information and to improve the process of data retrieval. The Intake Sheet was redesigned. The form was simplified, and the questions were pared down to what was considered the essential data for service. Confidential data was omitted from the Intake Sheet to avoid a breach of confidentiality.

The purpose of the revisions, aside from an improvement in clerical obligations, was to make the counselors responsible for maintaining a complete record on each client. The program was built around the counseling relationship; the logical extension of this fact was to feed all data on clients to the counselors for recording. Attached to this section is a staff memo which outlines the revised system.

C. Basic Education and Training Components

C.1 - Shops

The use of vocational shops in high schools for manpower training has an obvious economic advantage. The disadvantage is that they are only available part-time. If the trainees have had no experience with the skill being taught, successful training will require a long investment of time. The longer the training takes, the less likely it is that disadvantaged youths will finish it.

Our experience indicated that youths who moved from a training shop to a job in a related field had had some prior training, usually in school. Also, the training-related jobs were in commercial fields, not industrial. From the standard manpower concept of training, our shops were refresher courses.

The shops had a broader justification than job preparation. They functioned as vestibule facilities, leading to institutional training or a return to school. As such, the shops contributed to an improvement of the trainees' enthusiasm and tolerance for training. Frequently, the desire to learn how to type led to enrollment in a remedial reading class.

The shops also increased the program's holding power. If one accepts the premise that time spent in a manpower program is beneficial to disadvantaged youths, then this factor is significant. We hold that opinion unequivocally, based on almost three years of experience.

We also feel the shops have to be small in size and structured in such a way that new trainees can move in at any time. With some limitations, the shops would adjust to the needs of all the trainees.

C.2 - Classes

The whole field of basic education became extremely important to the program. Most of the clients who came to us needed help in reading and mathematics; many job referrals were unsuccessful because of deficiencies in these two areas.

The major problem remains providing enough individual instruction to overcome the learning disabilities of our clients. This is less serious in the High School Equivalency classes, where the youths are able enough to do a lot of work on their own. However, the remedial reading classes and the basic computational classes in mathematics depend almost entirely on individual instruction, which of course is expensive and time consuming.

The use of tutors reduces the problem. We have been fortunate to have the help of college students from work-study programs as tutors, and the instructors have been enthusiastic about the expanded services they could provide through the tutors. In the absence of any definitive remedial curriulum, the basic education component will continue to depend on the tutors, and the instruction and leadership of remedial experts from the schools.

D. Job Development and Placement

As we have said repeatedly, the JCC would not have existed without its placement component. The close cooperation of counselors and job developers has led to one of the best placement reputations in the City. The job developers have demonstrated that placement does not have to be an isolated last step in a manpower program, that in fact it belongs deeply enmeshed in the web of the total package that a manpower program offers.

D.1 - Early Placement

The proposal stressed early placement as one approach to the problems of disadvantaged youths seeking help from a manpower program. That this was a demonstration feature rather than an operational service was due primarily to the elusiveness of the answers to two questions: would it work? and, would it help?

The job developers have demonstrated a positive answer to the first question. They placed youths in all the entry level categories that were open to programs working with minority group youths, and they breached enough barriers to prove that they were not merely feeding that class of employers which stays in business through exploitation.

They have shown that youths seeking employment can get jobs that are challenging and are rewarding in terms of upgrading potential. They have shown that it is possible for a manpower program to keep a disadvantaged youth gainfully employed for an extensive period of time, during which all the other benefits of the program have time to make their impact.

They have shown that work experience in the private sector is available to dropouts, poor kids, minority group members, and all the other labels that infect the social vocabulary. The confidence and pride of the entire staff is due primarily to the knowledge that the JCC has helped so many youths get started; in most cases, that start was a decent job.

D.2 - Program Development

In addition to finding jobs in the private sector, the job developers had the responsibility of finding all the special services and training opportunities designed for our target population. The importance of this activity has increased. as the variety and number of special programs have increased. The JCC now has a much broader range of services at its disposal than it had eighteen months ago.

The job developers have acquired an expertise in finding special programs and developing the cooperation of their staffs. The problems of coordination, referral techniques, and feedback communication have been significantly reduced.

The use of outside agencies for special services is not a revolutionary development, but it has become, at least for us, increasingly important. It is also hazardous. The job developers have given encouraging evidence that the hazards can be minimized and the results can be extremely rewarding.

JOB COUNSELING CENTER
BOARD OF EDUCATION
198 Forsyth Street
New York, New York 10002

FORMS AND RECORDS

1.) INTAKE SHEET
   a. Form - printed snap-out sheet, three copies
   b. Origin - Intake receptionist (aide or secy.) fills out top part, counselor completes.
   c. Purpose - to record characteristics at intake.
   d. Distribution - (1) kept by counselor in client's folder
      (1) forwarded to central file at day office
      (1) brought to job developer with client

2.) COUNSELING RECORD
   a. Form - single sheet, printed, in pads
   b. Origin - counselor
   c. Purpose - to record confidential notes, anecdotal matl., client's goals, etc.
   d. Distribution - kept in client's folder

3.) PROGRESS SHEET
   a. Form - single sheet, printed
   b. Origin - heading filled in by intake receptionist at intake
   c. Purpose - to record all client's activities in the program
   d. Distribution - kept in client's folder
   e. Maintenance - counselor or counselor aide

4.) ATTENDANCE ROSTERS - Shops and Classes
   a. Form - single sheet, mimeo
   b. Origin - instructors
   c. Purpose - to record attendance
   d. Distribution - to evening secretary

5.) PLACEMENT RECORD
   a. Form - printed sheets, in pads
   b. Origin - job developers
   c. Purpose - to record referrals and placements (weekly)
   d. Distribution - (1) to evening center
      (1) job developer file

RESPONSIBILITY FOR RECORD KEEPING

1.) COUNSELOR
    - a. complete Intake Sheet
    - b. maintain Counseling Record
    - c. maintain Progress sheet
    - d. complete weekly summary

2.) JOB DEVELOPER
    - a. maintain weekly placement record
    - b. maintain individual cards on clients referred
    - c. maintain central file on special programs and training courses

3.) INSTRUCTORS
    - a. complete attendance rosters
    - b. maintain evaluative records (to be determined)

4.) CENTER ADMINISTRATORS
    - a. complete weekly summary
    - b. supervise all record keeping

Secretaries will be used in these functions as the Center Administrator best sees fit.
These are our minimum requirements of record keeping. You may add to these to meet particular needs, but you may not substitute your own forms or your own methods for any of the records listed above.